

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 207

FL 022 495

AUTHOR Marriott, Helen; And Others  
TITLE Unlocking Australia's Language Potential. Profiles of  
9 Key Languages in Australia. Volume 7: Japanese.  
INSTITUTION Australian National Languages and Literacy Inst.,  
Deakin.  
REPORT NO ISBN-1-875578-14-5  
PUB DATE 94  
NOTE 186p.; For related documents, see FL 022 493-497 and  
ED 365 111-114.  
AVAILABLE FROM NLLIA, 9th Level, 300 Flinders St., Melbourne,  
Victoria 3000, Australia.  
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Tests/Evaluation  
Instruments (160)  
  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; College Graduates; College  
Students; \*Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education;  
Educational Attitudes; Educational Change;  
Educational History; \*Educational Needs; Educational  
Objectives; Educational Quality; Educational Trends;  
Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Rate;  
Foreign Countries; Higher Education; \*International  
Trade; \*Japanese; \*Language Proficiency; \*Language  
Role; Language Teachers; Language Usage; Regional  
Characteristics; Second Language Instruction; Second  
Language Learning; Student Motivation; Teacher  
Qualifications; Teaching Methods; Testing; Trend  
Analysis  
IDENTIFIERS \*Australia

## ABSTRACT

The report on the status of Japanese language teaching in Australia gives a broad view of Japanese study and discusses current educational issues in some detail. An introductory chapter offers a brief overview of the history, objectives, and issues of Japanese language instruction in Australia. The second chapter details features of instructional programs at each level (elementary, secondary, higher, technical, and continuing education) and in ethnic schools. Chapter 3 looks at qualitative changes in Japanese language instruction in the last three decades, including shifts from grammar translation method to audiolingual and post-audiolingual methodology, language teaching to interaction teaching, later to earlier introduction, native to contact situations, general to specialized courses, classroom to external learning, and teaching acquisition skills to what was traditionally viewed as passive learners to teaching active, creative learners. The fourth chapter provides information on the characteristics and training of Japanese language teachers at all levels. Chapter 5 summarizes research on secondary school students' motivation for Japanese study, and chapter 6 reports a study of the career goals and anticipated language use of university Japanese program graduates. The final chapter discusses specific issues in language instruction, including testing, curriculum development, professional associations and other organizational support, the Japanese community in Australia, and tourism. Enrollment data, a list of higher education institutions teaching Japanese in Australia in 1992, and a language study questionnaire are appended. Contains 112 references. (MSE)

# Unlocking Australia's Language Potential

Profiles of 9 Key Languages in Australia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Le  
Bianco

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**Vol. 7 - Japanese**

Helen Marriott  
J V Neustupny  
Robin Spence-Brown

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

FL022495

**DEET**

# Unlocking Australia's Language Potential

## PROFILES OF 9 KEY LANGUAGES IN AUSTRALIA

---

### Volume 7: Japanese



Canberra



**National Library of Australia Cataloguing in Publication Data**

Unlocking Australia's Language Potential: Profile of 9 Key Languages in Australia:  
Volume 7 - Japanese

**Bibliography.**

Includes index.

ISBN 1 875578 07 2 (set)

ISBN 1 875578 08 0 (v.1)

ISBN 1 875578 09 9 (v.2)

ISBN 1 875578 10 2 (v.3)

ISBN 1 875578 11 0 (v.4)

ISBN 1 875578 12 9 (v.5)

ISBN 1 875578 13 7 (v.6)

ISBN 1 875578 14 5 (v.7)

ISBN 1 875578 15 3 (v.8)

ISBN 1 875578 16 1 (v.9)

1. Language and languages - Study and teaching - Australia. 2. Australia - Languages  
Study and teaching - Foreign speakers. I. National Languages and Literacy Institute of  
Australia. II. Australian Second Language Learning Program

© Commonwealth of Australia and NLLIA

ISBN 1 875578 14 5

This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may  
be reproduced by any process without the written permission of the NLLIA and the  
Commonwealth.

418.007

*The funding for this project was provided under the Australian Second Language Learning Program of the  
National Policy on Languages by DEET. Additional funding was provided by the NLLIA.*

*The views expressed here do not necessarily represent the views of the Commonwealth or the NLLIA.*



**National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia Limited**  
Level 2, 6 Campion St, Deakin ACT 2600 Australia  
Tel: (06) 281 3366 Fax: (06) 281 3096



## **The National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia Limited**

The National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia Limited (NLLIA) was established in 1990 as the Key Centre for Language Teaching and Research to meet the goals and principles of the 1987 National Policy on Languages. Under the 1991 Australian Language and Literacy Policy, the mandate of the NLLIA was modified to include a heightened focus on literacy.

The NLLIA consists of

- The NLLIA Directorate
- The NLLIA-Languages and Adult Literacy Information and Resources Centre
- The NLLIA-Business Language Services
- The NLLIA-Child Literacy and ESL Research Network
- The NLLIA-Adult Literacy Research Network
- The NLLIA-Language and Society Centre
- The NLLIA-Language Acquisition Research Centre
- The NLLIA-Centre For Workplace Communication and Culture
- The NLLIA-Language and Technology Centre
- The NLLIA-Centre for Deafness and Communication Studies
- The NLLIA-Language Testing Centre
- The NLLIA-Language Testing and Curriculum Centre
- The NLLIA-Western Australia Office
- The NLLIA-South Australian Teaching and Curriculum Centre
- The NLLIA-Document Design and Research Unit
- The NLLIA-Style Council

The NLLIA offers national leadership and guidance on language education issues by:

- providing professional development activities for language lecturers, teacher trainers and teachers
- creating and operating a database and clearing house on language education issues and regularly disseminating information from these
- facilitating and conducting research needed to improve practice in language education
- regularly assessing language education needs by providing advisory and consultancy services to government, unions, business and the community on relevant language issues.

### **NLLIA Directorate**

Level 2  
6 Champion St  
Deakin ACT 2600  
Australia  
Tel: (06) 281 3366  
Fax: (06) 281 3096

**THE NATIONAL  
LANGUAGES &  
LITERACY  
INSTITUTE  
OF AUSTRALIA**

# Table of Contents

|                                                                                              |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| FOREWORD                                                                                     | i   |
| PREFACE                                                                                      | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT                                                                              | iii |
| STEERING COMMITTEE                                                                           | iv  |
| KEY RECOMMENDATIONS                                                                          | v   |
| 1 INTRODUCTION                                                                               | 1   |
| 1.1 Japanese language study in Australia                                                     | 1   |
| 1.2 A short history                                                                          | 1   |
| 1.3 Current issues                                                                           | 2   |
| 1.3.1 How much should languages be studied?                                                  | 2   |
| 1.3.2 Which languages?                                                                       | 3   |
| 1.3.3 Why teach Japanese?                                                                    | 4   |
| 1.3.4 What level of competence should we aim at?                                             | 4   |
| 1.3.5 Teaching language, communication or interaction?                                       | 5   |
| 1.3.6 The quality of teachers                                                                | 6   |
| 1.3.7 Teaching methods                                                                       | 6   |
| 1.3.8 Testing                                                                                | 6   |
| 1.3.9 Who should control and develop Japanese language teaching?                             | 6   |
| 2 THE STUDY OF JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIA TODAY                                                   | 8   |
| 2.1 Introduction                                                                             | 8   |
| 2.2 The primary level                                                                        | 9   |
| 2.2.1 Introduction                                                                           | 9   |
| 2.2.2 Growth of Japanese language programs                                                   | 9   |
| 2.2.3 Features of Japanese programs                                                          | 12  |
| 2.2.4 Conclusion                                                                             | 14  |
| 2.3 The secondary level                                                                      | 15  |
| 2.3.1 Introduction                                                                           | 15  |
| 2.3.2 Growth of Japanese language programs                                                   | 15  |
| 2.3.3 Some features of Japanese language courses                                             | 19  |
| 2.3.4 Conclusion                                                                             | 25  |
| 2.4 The higher education level                                                               | 25  |
| 2.4.1 Introduction                                                                           | 25  |
| 2.4.2 Availability of Japanese                                                               | 26  |
| 2.4.3 Growth of Japanese                                                                     | 26  |
| 2.4.4 Student enrolment                                                                      | 27  |
| 2.4.5 Honours and postgraduate levels                                                        | 29  |
| 2.4.6 Some features of Japanese undergraduate programs                                       | 31  |
| 2.4.7 Some problems at the high education level                                              | 38  |
| 2.5 The Technical and Further Education (TAFE) Level                                         | 42  |
| 2.5.1 Introduction                                                                           | 42  |
| 2.5.2 Types of programs and size of enrolments                                               | 42  |
| 2.5.3 Features of the programs                                                               | 43  |
| 2.5.4 Conclusion                                                                             | 43  |
| 2.6 Ethnic schools                                                                           | 44  |
| 2.7 Other courses                                                                            | 46  |
| 3 QUALITATIVE CHANGES IN JAPANESE LANGUAGE STUDY                                             | 49  |
| 3.1 From grammar translation teaching to the audiolingual and the post-audiolingual paradigm | 49  |
| 3.2 From language teaching to interaction teaching                                           | 51  |

|         |                                                                                 |     |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3.3     | From university study to the primary level                                      | 53  |
| 3.4     | From native to contact situations                                               | 54  |
| 3.5     | From general to specialised courses                                             | 56  |
| 3.6     | From classroom teaching to external learning situations                         | 57  |
| 3.7     | Towards teaching acquisition skills                                             | 57  |
| 3.8     | Conclusion                                                                      | 58  |
| 4       | JAPANESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS                                                      | 59  |
| 4.1     | Introduction                                                                    | 59  |
| 4.2     | Primary level teachers                                                          | 62  |
| 4.3     | Secondary level teachers                                                        | 73  |
| 4.4     | Higher education staff                                                          | 76  |
| 4.5     | TAFE staff                                                                      | 77  |
| 4.6     | Notes on teacher education                                                      |     |
| 5       | SECONDARY STUDENT MOTIVATION TO CONTINUE<br>OR DISCONTINUE JAPANESE             | 80  |
| 5.1     | The issue: motivation                                                           | 81  |
| 5.2     | The data                                                                        | 81  |
| 5.2.1   | The source of the data                                                          | 82  |
| 5.2.2   | Number of respondents                                                           | 82  |
| 5.2.3   | States                                                                          | 83  |
| 5.2.4   | Government, Independent and Catholic schools                                    | 83  |
| 5.2.5   | Sex of respondents                                                              | 83  |
| 5.2.6   | Ethnic origin                                                                   | 84  |
| 5.2.7   | Socio-economic background                                                       | 84  |
| 5.2.8   | Selection of subjects in Year 11                                                | 85  |
| 5.2.9   | Profile of the Japanese student                                                 | 85  |
| 5.3     | Positive motivation of the students                                             | 86  |
| 5.3.1   | Interactive motivation                                                          | 88  |
| 5.3.2   | Understanding of culture as a motive                                            | 88  |
| 5.3.3   | Symbolic motivation                                                             | 88  |
| 5.3.4   | Affective motivation                                                            | 89  |
| 5.3.5   | Social motivation                                                               | 90  |
| 5.3.6   | Positive motivation: a summary                                                  | 91  |
| 5.4     | Negative motivation: reasons for discontinuation                                | 91  |
| 5.4.1   | Students who did not wish to continue and students who discontinued unwillingly | 92  |
| 5.4.2   | Students who did not wish to continue                                           | 92  |
| 5.4.3   | Students who discontinued unwillingly                                           | 93  |
| 5.4.4   | Negative motivation: a summary                                                  |     |
| 6       | CAREER DESTINATIONS OF GRADUATES AND THEIR USAGE OF JAPANESE                    | 94  |
| 6.1     | Data collection                                                                 | 95  |
| 6.2     | Qualifications                                                                  | 95  |
| 6.2.1   | Undergraduate qualifications                                                    | 96  |
| 6.2.1.1 | Subjects taken in undergraduate course: Japanese                                | 96  |
| 6.2.1.2 | Other disciplines                                                               | 97  |
| 6.2.2   | Postgraduate qualifications                                                     | 99  |
| 6.2.3   | Other training                                                                  | 100 |
| 6.2.4   | Time spent in Japan                                                             | 101 |
| 6.3     | Employment                                                                      | 102 |
| 6.3.1   | Sector of employment and employer                                               | 106 |
| 6.3.2   | Salary                                                                          |     |

|            |                                                                                            |     |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 6.4        | Use of Japanese skills in employment                                                       | 107 |
| 6.4.1      | Types of language skills used                                                              | 109 |
| 6.4.2      | Significance of Japan-related skills in careers                                            | 110 |
| 6.5        | Adequacy of Japan-related training and desire to undertake further study                   | 110 |
| 7          | SOME INDIVIDUAL ISSUES                                                                     | 112 |
| 7.1        | Testing in Japanese language teaching                                                      | 112 |
| 7.1.1      | Introduction                                                                               | 112 |
| 7.1.2      | 'Achievement' testing: the tertiary level                                                  | 113 |
| 7.1.3      | Testing at the Year 12 level                                                               | 119 |
| 7.1.4      | External 'proficiency' testing                                                             | 123 |
| 7.2        | Support for Japanese language teaching                                                     | 126 |
| 7.2.1      | National projects                                                                          | 126 |
| 7.2.2      | New curriculum development                                                                 | 127 |
| 7.2.3      | Professional support at the State level                                                    | 128 |
| 7.2.4      | Professional associations                                                                  | 129 |
| 7.2.5      | Other organisational support: the Japan Foundation                                         | 129 |
| 7.2.6      | National Forum on Japanese Language Teacher Education                                      | 130 |
| 7.3        | The Japanese in Australian society                                                         | 130 |
| 7.3.1      | Introduction                                                                               | 130 |
| 7.3.2      | The Japanese community in Australia                                                        | 130 |
| 7.3.3      | Contact within the tourism domain                                                          | 132 |
| 7.4        | The linguistic future of the pacific                                                       | 134 |
|            | RECOMMENDATIONS                                                                            | 136 |
|            | REFERENCES                                                                                 | 146 |
| APPENDIX 1 | ENROLMENTS IN JAPANESE ACCORDING TO YEAR AT THE PRIMARY LEVEL                              | 150 |
| APPENDIX 2 | ENROLMENTS IN JAPANESE ACCORDING TO YEAR AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL                            | 152 |
| APPENDIX 3 | HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TEACHING JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIA IN 1992                       | 155 |
| APPENDIX 4 | EFTSU ENROLMENT FIGURES FOR JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN 1992   | 156 |
| APPENDIX 5 | STUDENT ENROLMENT FIGURES FOR JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN 1992 | 157 |
| APPENDIX 6 | ADDITIONAL DATA ON HIGHER EDUCATION STAFF TEACHING JAPANESE                                | 159 |
| APPENDIX 7 | ATTITUDINAL SURVEY FORM                                                                    | 163 |



## Foreword

One of the consequences of the increased emphasis on language policy making from State and Federal Governments in recent years has been the proliferation of ways of categorising languages. The nine languages featured in these profile studies were categorised as Languages of Wider Teaching.

There are obviously other ways in which the languages could have been classified. Any one of a large number of possible categories could have been used but this particular group of nine was listed in the National Policy on Languages as languages which either already had or could reasonably be predicted to have the majority of all languages candidates in Australia.

This particular group of languages could not otherwise be classified together. They represent therefore the vast bulk of the second language learning effort in Australian education. As such these languages consume the greatest proportion of the resources devoted to the teaching of second languages in this country and will do so for several years to come.

In addition to this quantitative rationale for grouping these nine the following rationale supported this selection:

- that language/teaching efforts are to be harmonised with Australia's economic, national and external policy goals;
- that language teaching and learning efforts are to enhance Australia's place in Asia and the Pacific and its capacity to play its role as a full and active member of world forums; and
- that, for planning purposes, resources allocation efforts and the establishment of achievable long-term goals, choices must be made on language issues (National Policy on Languages 1987:124).

These nine were seen to combine internally orientated reasons for language study (intercultural, community bilingualism rationales) with perceived externally oriented reasons (economic and international relations rationales) with a pragmatic sense that only a selection from the very many possible languages that could be promoted, should be.

The nine languages selected were: Arabic, Modern Standard Chinese, French, German, Modern Greek, Indonesian/Malay, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. In early 1990 the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education which was charged with the responsibility for the implementation of the National Policy on Languages decided to review the teaching and place of the nine languages since their designation as Languages of Wider Teaching. Funding was provided under the Australian Second Language Learning Program for the conduct of profile studies of the nine.

The NLLIA was successful in its bid for these funds and co-ordinated a national project of the research teams described in the volumes. The researchers and the teams that assisted them were scattered across Australia and the co-ordination of their efforts was a major activity on its own. I wish to acknowledge the efforts of Dr Tony

Liddicoat, Mr Athol Yates, Dr Richard Baldauf, Dr Pauline Bryant and other NLLIA staff for succeeding in this difficult task.

In addition, the NLLIA is producing a summary volume. This will present an overview of the nine language profiles and an analysis of the most interesting and revealing differences and similarities among them. This is being written by Dr Paulin Djité of the University of Sydney.

These studies represent more than a review of the state of play after some years of designation of these nine languages as key languages. They promise to bring about a more precise and language specific form of planning for the teaching and learning of languages in Australian education and therefore could well represent a more mature phase in policy making itself. In recent years language policies have made only generic statements about individual, or groups of, languages. Since there is now a high level of consensus across Australia about the importance of Asian languages, the necessity of keeping strong European-world languages and the domestic value of multilingualism these profiles will probably focus attention on the particular issues that affect the 'condition' of individual languages considered important.

The classification, Languages of Wider Teaching is, however, no longer used. In the Australian Language and Literacy Policy issued by the Federal Government in September 1991, the Commonwealth identified 14 languages; incorporating the present nine. These 14 languages were called priority languages. Under the Commonwealth's Priority Languages Incentives Scheme education systems, the States and Territories select eight each as the basis of the funding support they receive from the Commonwealth under the Australian Language and Literacy Policy.

These languages are: Aboriginal Languages, Arabic, Modern Standard Chinese, French, German, Modern Greek, Indonesian/Malay, Italian, Japanese, Spanish, Russian, Thai, Korean and Vietnamese.

It would be desirable to extend the profile analysis contained in these volumes to those languages not presently surveyed. In its work on Russian, the NLLIA is in a strong position to commence a profile analysis of Russian and is considering extending this to Thai, Korean and Vietnamese.

Joseph Lo Bianco  
Director, NLLIA  
March 1994

---

## Preface

The inventiveness, originality and vigour of Japanese civilisation has long been covered under the Eurocentric world view of the West and the unfortunate attempt of Japan to join the Western nations in the colonial expansion. Japan is the first non-European nation which has fully developed a truly modern culture, while retaining the wisdom and beauty of its tradition. Japan today also has a powerful economy, with the second highest GNP in the world. Many nations look to Japan as a model for restructuring and further development.

The build-up of Australian-Japanese relations after WWII and changes in Australian perceptions of the world led towards the end of the 1980s to a sudden increase in the interest of the Australian community in the study of the Japanese language. What is the current situation and what are the problems to be solved?

This report surveys the issues at all levels of education and presents a number of suggestions.

Chapters 1, 3 and 5 and Sections 2.6, 2.7, 4.6, and 7.4 were written by J.V. Neustupný, H.E. Marriott authored Chapter 4 and Sections 2.0 - 2.5 and 7.3. R. Spence-Brown has provided Chapters 6 and 7. All three authors are responsible for the Recommendations.

Helen E. Marriott  
Jirí V. Neustupný  
Robyn Spence-Brown  
MONASH UNIVERSITY

July 1993

---

## Acknowledgement

We wish to acknowledge the assistance of Lyndell Roper in gathering the data for this report.

---

## Steering Committee

Ms Debra Batson, Primary school teacher of Japanese, Keysborough Primary School, Victoria

Ms Sue Burnham, Japanese Language Adviser, The Japan Foundation, Sydney Language Centre

Ms Lyn Gourlay, Institute of Education, University of Melbourne

Ms Lyndell Roper, Former secondary school teacher of Japanese, Project Research Assistant

Ms Robyn Spence-Brown, Lecturer, Monash University

Professor J.V. Neustupný, Department of Japanese Studies, Monash University, Project Co-ordinator

Acting Professor Helen Marriott, Head of Department, Department of Japanese Studies, Monash University, Project Co-ordinator

Several members have subsequently changed positions.

---

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

This Report documents the growth, both quantitative and qualitative, of Japanese language education in Australia. The system is characterised by a large number of positive features which grant it a very special position internationally. However, there is no place for complacency. Australia needs more Japan-literacy than it possesses at this moment. It must develop its Japanese language education beyond the present stage.

A full set of recommendations is included at the end of this Report. They reflect a view that not only keeps pace with current development in language teaching in general but looks into the twenty-first century. The Recommendations form a whole, and must be read as such. The summary which follows here can hardly do justice to the whole range of needs but it may serve as a suitable introduction to this volume. (Recommendations concerning methodology, which are of more specialised nature, will not be summarised here.)

### Japan literacy

1. It is essential that any further growth of Japanese language study in Australia be a part of the general growth of all language studies undertaken in the country.
2. A larger number of people than at present must master the Japanese language in addition to understanding the cultural components of interaction with the Japanese. However, there is an urgent need for still wider strata of the population to undertake interaction studies which do not include a Japanese language component but will provide them with limited degrees of Japan literacy.

### Primary, secondary and tertiary levels

3. The de facto discrimination against language studies at higher levels of secondary education must be removed.
4. The number of students of the Japanese language still needs to grow and should be planned to meet the existing and prospective demand for people with different degrees of Japan literacy.
5. The aims of Japanese courses should be appropriate to the level of the students and should not necessarily be guided solely by economic aims.
6. It is necessary to realise that further improvement requires not only students and teachers but also the development of new courses. There is a need for a variety of courses. While encouraging greater coordination, it is also necessary to protect diversity which alone can guarantee further qualitative growth.

7. The inclusion of components on Japan within Japanese language courses, and development of special courses and course components without language should be a guiding principle for all levels.
8. All states should support teachers of Japanese by appointing suitable coordinators or advisers within their ministries or education departments.
9. At the tertiary level Japanese and Japanese studies should be freely available to students in all faculties. At the same time, a variety of non-standard courses needs to be strengthened: specialised, accelerated and intensive courses for students with previous competence, advanced and semi-native speakers. Particular attention must be paid to combined and double degrees, honours and postgraduate courses. These are courses which supply the community with graduates who have achieved very high levels of competence in Japanese. The need for on-going education and professional development should receive adequate support from Australian universities.
11. Current levels of casual staff at the tertiary level should be lowered and the funding formulas revised.
12. All tertiary institutions should ensure that their courses are directed and taught by specialists in Japanese language teaching.
13. Travel to Japan and exchanges with Japanese institutions require very intensive support at all levels.

## **Teacher support and education**

14. The number of teachers of Japanese is totally insufficient. It is necessary to take immediate measures to recruit new teachers from among recent graduates and from Japan. There is a need to increase radically intake into teacher education courses for Japanese.
15. There is a need for a variety of teacher education programs catering for the primary, secondary, tertiary and continuing education sectors of teaching.
16. Traditional Diploma of Education programs are not adequately meeting the needs of teachers and need to be reformed to include greater knowledge of Japanese linguistics, sociolinguistics, knowledge of Japan and of specific Japanese methodology. Language maintenance and development should also be included in future programs.
17. Too little or too much emphasis on language competence of teachers can be detrimental. Teachers should be given the chance to improve their Japanese on an on-going basis and the use of teaching assistants as language models should become universal.

## Other issues

18. Travelling seminars should be organised in the capital cities to familiarise Japanese language teachers with new developments in language teaching, testing and other issues.

19. The issue of testing is vital for Japanese language teaching not only because it was traditionally neglected but also because of its possible positive or negative 'backwash'. It is essential that Japanese language teachers participate in the debate concerning testing and in any developments which take place. This has not always been the case in the past. As part of this process a national conference on the proficiency testing of students and teachers, and other issues related to setting and maintaining standards and ensuring compatibility, should be convened.

## Action and cost of recommendations

The recommendations of this report are relevant to a number of different bodies. Many of them will require additional Commonwealth or State government funding. Some of these include:

1. Appointment of specialist Japanese language advisers in the States and systems where these do not exist. Cooperative arrangements with the Japan Foundation may be possible.

Cost: approximately \$60,000 per State/system p.a. (x 4)

2. Sponsorship of a conference on testing, standards and other quality issues to cover primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

Cost: \$100,000. (To cover travel and accommodation of 50 tertiary and 50 to 100 primary and secondary teachers representing all States and systems, and presenters; conference organisation.)

3. Sponsorship of a travelling seminar.

Cost: \$200,000 p.a. (5 specialists x seminars in 3 venues). (To cover travel and accommodation of five specialists presenting seminars in three different States; seminar organisation.)

4. Improvement of scholarship support to undergraduates, Honours students and postgraduates specialising in Japanese language and/or studies by increasing the number of awards made under the National Asian Languages Scholarship Scheme and the Australian Awards for Research in Asia. Make at least 100 awards per year to undergraduates and 50 awards to Honours and postgraduate students.

Cost: \$15,000 per student p.a. Total cost: \$2,250,000 p.a.

5. Commission of an evaluation of exchange and study abroad programs, including the new University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) programs.

Cost: \$100,000. (To cover institutional survey and survey [interviews and questionnaires] of participants to examine gains made in academic education, language proficiency and cultural learning. Compilation of testing instruments and the collection of natural recordings of discourse to determine language proficiency gains.)

6. Commission of the design of some specialised language courses for TAFEs and universities.

Cost: \$80,000 per course (x 3). Total cost: \$240,000

7. Commission the design of a specialised course in the teaching of Japanese as foreign language (for use in Diploma of Education courses).

Cost: \$80,000

**TOTAL COST OF ABOVE RECOMMENDATIONS: \$3,210,000**

The report contains many other detailed recommendations. Educators, planners and other interested persons are urged to read the final full list of recommendations carefully.

---



# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Japanese Language Study in Australia

The teaching of Japanese as a foreign language in Australia presents the most extensive, developed and stratified system in the world, other than in Japan itself. Unlike the teaching of Latin, French or German, Japanese language teaching has developed more recently, mostly in the latter half of the 1960s and 1970s. There was a substantial increase in student numbers in 1988 and enrolments have continued rising.

However, from a more critical point of view, it can also be argued that Japanese language teaching in Australia is not extensive enough to cover the existing demand, that it urgently needs further development, and that it ought to provide more diversified opportunities for more Australians to understand Japan and interact with it.

This report will examine the present state of the study of Japanese in Australia. It will present facts as well as ideas and, hopefully, will contribute to its further development.

## 1.2 A Short History

Japanese language has been taught in Australia since the second decade of this century when Japanese was introduced at Sydney University in 1917 and James Murdoch was appointed to the Chair of Oriental Studies in the following year (Clarke 1989). The Sydney department has continued its existence ever since, although until the 1960s its size remained limited. Japanese was also taught in Australia before World War II at a number of secondary schools and was sometimes available as an examination subject. We were unable to collect information on the situation during the war.

In the mid 1960s the situation underwent a radical change in two major ways. One was the introduction of Japanese at a number of Australian universities. Along with this came more teaching of the language in the secondary school system and a systematic introduction of Japanese as a subject for school examinations, including the Year 12 examinations. Contacts with Japan increased and the number of students gradually grew, although it still significantly lagged behind the enrolment numbers for the major European languages. Already in this period the enrolments per head of population reached one of the highest levels in the world (Neustupný 1976). Japanese also began to be introduced as a subject at the postgraduate level.

The second major transformation took place in 1988 when the enrolment figures in the tertiary sector doubled; they continued rising, at both the tertiary and secondary levels, and in the following years Japanese overtook French at the tertiary level. (For a discussion of the factors which influenced this increase of interest in Japanese see Marriott 1992a,b and Neustupný 1992a.) Along with

other languages, Japanese was expanding rapidly at the primary level as well and, at the other end of the scale, enrolments at the postgraduate level were consolidated. A number of courses in Japanese for Special Purposes appeared, Business Japanese being the most typical of the new developments.

While until the late 1970s most Japanese language teaching employed frameworks available in language teaching since the end of WWII, in the 1970s and particularly in the 1980s the thinking about language teaching within the profession underwent significant changes. These changes have not affected the whole profession yet, but they have been distributed widely. A number of basic assumptions about language study have changed. These changes will be discussed in some detail in Chapter 3.

---

## **1.3 Current Issues**

Australian society today is highly interested in the study of Japanese. A number of issues connected with the processes described above attract the conscious attention of policy makers and all others involved. Some of these issues are wider than the narrowly conceived problems of the teaching of Japanese. Let us mention a few of them at the outset of our study.

---

### **1.3.1 How much should languages be studied?**

This is a basic issue which is not discussed as much as it should be. What percentage of time should be devoted to the study of language (and Japanese) at the primary, secondary and tertiary level, in active employment situations and after retirement? Note that the current consensus in the community seems to be that the peak of the process should be located at the secondary level, with the primary and tertiary sector playing a more limited role and the adult life cycles being very marginal in the process. This distribution is in no way 'natural' and can be questioned. For example, one could argue that much more attention should be given to language acquisition in employment situations, where communication needs may provide a strongly supportive environment for learning. Britain and other countries have built up frameworks in which young professionals can acquire Japanese while working in managerial positions. This trend in Australia is minuscule.

The same question is relevant at each age level. For example, how much time should be devoted to the study of languages within the secondary system of education? The fact is that languages are clearly losing to other areas, such as mathematics or the sciences. Those concerned are worried but there is no public discussion of the issue. Again, it cannot be maintained that it is 'natural' to spend more time on mathematics or physics at the secondary level. The question is whether the role allotted to languages in Australia adequately reflects the present trends in the internationalisation of world societies.

The Government, Japanese language teachers and others interested in the development of Japanese language studies in Australia should watch the situation very closely. It is silly to argue with other languages about the slice of a pie without accepting that the pie should first grow, to allow for every slice to expand.

An additional question is how much language should be studied by different groups of potential users. Some people will be in daily contact with the Japanese. Others will meet them only occasionally and in specialised situations. Still others will only have the opportunity to exchange a few words over a large span of time. Should they all study the same amount and same kind of language?

### 1.3.2 Which languages?

It is time to admit openly that there is a considerable disparity of interests between those who support an emphasis on European and Asian languages. The controversy is alive and cannot be solved by closing our eyes to it.

In the past European languages such as French or German enjoyed a hegemony which was in fact unchallenged even in the 1970s. Large professions developed and it is only natural that members of these professions regret that the situation has changed. They are sometimes joined by people who have an emotional commitment to European cultures and by social conservatives who regret that the Western domination of the world is declining. Others argue that since the situation of the world has changed and Australia cannot ignore its Asian neighbourhood, the established European languages should not expect to retain their past strength. Many Australian students are giving *de facto* support to this position through enrolment in Asian languages.

Asian languages are not the only rising stars. The study of Italian, Greek and other community languages is also increasing. The question is sometimes posed as either Asian or European languages. We regret the existence of this dichotomy in the minds of some people.

Within the area of Asian languages we can witness a feeling of uneasiness between advocates of Japanese, which at present attracts the vast majority of learners, and representatives of the other languages. Is it possible to raise enrolments in other Asian languages to the level of Japanese through administrative action, and in what way can this be achieved?

In other words, there are different interests - a phenomenon not unusual in language planning (Jernudd and Neustupný 1987) - and different social groups defend their own positions. Can we require that participants in the process admit the existence of such subjective positions and try to reach a more rational solution that would satisfy more than one's own social group? Do decision makers and teachers of Japanese in fact ask themselves whether the slice they are taking from the overall language teaching pie is justified from the point of view of social and individual needs and whether they are not at any moment taking

more than what is reasonable if the interests of other languages are to be safeguarded?

---

### **1.3.3 Why teach Japanese?**

The two issues discussed above are intimately connected with the question of why Japanese should be taught. Many claim that Japanese is a necessary tool for interacting with Japan, primarily at the economic level. Of course, this is important. However, there are others who maintain that the study of Japanese should also or, perhaps primarily, be used as a tool for making students understand how human language, communication and society work. This claim cannot be simply neglected because Japanese and Japan certainly provide an excellent opportunity for discharging this function. Still others assert that the study of languages, in our case Japanese, fulfils the 'skill formation function'. Students learn how to acquire an extensive system of knowledge. This knowledge accumulates - one area is closely connected with others. Not many school subjects can serve this purpose as well as can language.

Do decision makers, teachers and students of Japanese always think about what their objectives are and how they translate to more local objectives and aims? If it is true that Japanese should be taught primarily for interaction, does this apply equally to all levels? Do we possess sufficient knowledge concerning the needs of graduates who work in different walks of practical life? Sometimes the statements made by personnel managers do not reflect true needs, yet how often are these simply accepted? Can we disregard functions other than the interactive one?

Another important issue is that of teaching for general purposes or teaching for a particular purpose. Is it satisfactory to teach only general courses, or is it correct to further support the development of Japanese for business, tourism and other purposes?

---

### **1.3.4 What level of competence should we aim at?**

Two positions can be identified in the community. One is a completely unrealistic expectation with regard to the competence that can be achieved in Japanese language courses in Australia. Some people believe that the completion of a secondary course in Japanese will provide students with competence that will be immediately applicable in practical life. Reference to this issue will be found in Chapter 2.

On the other hand there are pessimists who cannot find anything positive about Japanese language study in Australia. A few years ago a professor of Japanese studies lamented that Australian students of Japanese do not acquire the competence to read books, listen to lectures and in general to use the language in complicated cultural and social situations. Is this true? Is there a need for adjustment upwards or downwards? Or have we achieved levels of competence that are fully satisfactory for the given purpose?

The issue of competence is also connected with the question of whether Japanese courses should concentrate on competence in speaking or include also competence in reading. If so, to what extent? This is a particularly important issue for Japanese, which possesses a very complicated system of writing, requiring considerable effort to achieve the same degree of literacy as is usual in the traditional European languages.

---

### 1.3.5 Teaching language, communication or interaction?

Some members of the community are realising today that traditional language teaching is not enough to achieve Japan-literacy. Language teaching traditionally meant the teaching of **grammatical competence**: grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and the script.

Others believe that language teaching should primarily teach how to communicate. These are people who back the **communicative** approach (cf. Richards and Rodgers 1986) which revolutionised language teaching in the last two decades. 'Communicative' has been defined in various ways, from the simple assertion that it is the use of the language system rather than the system itself that should be the object of study, to a full program of teaching all components of what Hymes called 'communicative competence' (Hymes 1972).

Still others claim that even communicative competence will not do. According to this position we do not communicate in order to communicate but to achieve particular aims in the process of economic, social or cultural interaction. From this realisation derives the concept of teaching for **interaction** rather than for communication alone.

The requirement of interaction teaching means that traditional language teaching has radically changed. Not only must language and communication be covered; it is equally necessary to introduce students in an intensive way to the culture and society of the countries where the language is spoken. The issue is of particular importance for languages such as Japanese, in the case of which grammatical, sociolinguistic as well as sociocultural competence are radically different from English. In a survey of Japanese language instruction in the United States, Jorden and Lambert adopt the terminology of the Foreign Service Institute and call Japanese a Category 4 language, which represents the most difficult level. They emphasise that 'Japanese emerges as probably the most difficult, even among Category 4 languages' (Jorden & Lambert 1991:3). This has certain implications for the teaching and learning of Japanese, although as will be argued in this report, misinformed views are rife.

Which of these three positions (teaching only linguistic competence, communication or interaction in general) should be followed in Japanese language study? Further, should courses in communication and sociocultural interaction be available without the study of the Japanese language? These questions are of considerable relevance.

---

### **1.3.6 The quality of teachers**

The quality of teaching in Japanese courses has frequently been questioned. Is it true that many teachers are only a few lessons in front of their students? Is there anything more positive to say about the Japanese teaching profession?

Furthermore, what is the role of personnel other than teachers - teaching assistants, interns, classroom visitors, Japanese residents and others in Japanese language study? To what extent can they compensate for the possible lack of competence of the teachers?

---

### **1.3.7 Teaching methods**

Teaching methods are not often the object of attention of decision makers but they are a very important matter for the teacher and the student. Is it true, as the Ingleson report suggested, that no teaching methodology is inherently superior to others and the selection of a teaching method should be an individual choice for each teacher (Report of the Inquiry into the Teaching of Asian Studies and Languages in Higher Education 1989)? How should we look at the survival of the grammar-translation method? Is the functional approach of the 1970s the most progressive methodology available at present?

---

### **1.3.8 Testing**

Until the 1990s, testing for Japanese was not an issue discussed at the national level. Of course, testing at Year 12 (HSC and other schemes) was considered in individual States and considerable improvement was achieved. However, little information on such testing has been available across State borders.

The situation changed with the initiative of the Asian Studies Council in 1990 which introduced the topic of proficiency testing into the Japanese profession. Proficiency testing had already been developed in Japan and attempts made to apply the tests overseas, including in Australia. Japanese language teachers and others started asking to what extent tests should be applied and how. They were also stimulated to take up the issue of testing in general and ask whether the current methods of assessment, as practiced in the discipline, were adequate and what should be done to improve the situation.

---

### **1.3.9 Who should control and develop Japanese language teaching?**

Until recently Japanese language teaching developed separately in individual States and Territories of Australia. There were attempts to exchange information, as in the *First Australian Seminar on Japanese Language Teaching* (Neustupný & Rowe 1976), or on the occasion of the course development projects

funded by the Government: the Alfonso project and the recent National Project. A *Japanese Language Teaching Newsletter* was published between 1980 and 1983. Biennial conferences of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia became a forum at which papers on Japanese language teaching could be presented. However, the exchange of information has never been very extensive.

One of the factors in the failure to achieve more co-operation was the problem of funding. As more and more funding for large projects became available in the late 1980s and the national perspective came to be promoted by the Government, significant moves towards co-ordination appeared in language teaching in general. So far, mostly the secondary level has been affected.

New questions arise from these developments. Can Japanese work on the same basis as other languages other than English (LOTEs)? How much should be standardised within the area of the teaching of Japanese? What measures can be taken to prevent cases in which a particular methodology supported by the Government lags behind a methodology available locally? Is the unification of curricula across the nation going to allow for sufficient variation on the basis of which new initiatives and new methodologies can develop? At this moment variation still exists. Should it be saved or should we move towards integration? Can a compromise be found?

The relationship of Japanese language teaching in Australia with the Japanese Government's policies is also being questioned. The Japanese Government has established a Japanese Language Centre in Sydney which provides useful help to the secondary and primary sectors. To what extent can the operation of the Centre be broadened without impinging on the necessary independence of Japanese language teaching in Australia? In what meaningful way can Australian teachers of Japanese co-operate with the Centre and other Japanese agents in the development of the discipline?

None of the questions above has a straightforward answer. Most of the issues will be discussed in the body of this report either explicitly or in an implicit way.

---



## 2 THE STUDY OF JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIA TODAY

### 2.1 Introduction

Whereas in the past Japanese was a minor foreign language in Australian education, in recent years it has achieved the status of a major language. Following establishment at the higher education level during the 1960s, Japanese programs commenced rather slowly in secondary schools during the 1970s and also became available in various community language programs. Later, Japanese was introduced in some Technical and Further Education (TAFE) programs and more recently it has begun to spread at the primary level. By mid-1991 Japanese was already the most widely available and most widely studied language at the higher education level (Report of the Review of the Teaching of Modern Languages in Higher Education 1991).

While the past five years have seen a period of activity and growth in a number of languages in the education system, Japanese has exhibited the most spectacular growth by far. This is an extremely significant development, for it represents growth of a language which is decisively a foreign language for practically all of its learners. Contrary to the situation with a number of other languages, the learning of Japanese does not serve the purpose of language maintenance for an immigrant community.

The Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) estimates that in 1992 there were 105,000 students of Japanese, made up of 95,000 in primary and secondary schools, 7,000 at university and 3,000 enrolled in TAFE courses (Australia-Japan Research Centre 1992:12). Of those studying Japanese at the secondary level, it is reported that in 1990 there were 3,200 students in Year 12, a figure which is increasing at over 20% each year (Tourism Training Australia 1992:15). Even according to Japan Foundation statistics of 62,023 students studying Japanese in Australia at formal institutions - a figure which seems too low - Australia is the overseas country with the largest number of students of Japanese, after Korea and China (Japan Foundation 1992:9). On a per capita basis, such a figure means that Australia has the largest number of learners of Japanese.

In this chapter we present statistics showing that in 1991 there were at least 37,845 learners of Japanese at the primary level and a further 74,210 at the secondary level, giving a total of 112,055. Using data from the first count of the 1991 census (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1993), learners of Japanese at that time constituted 0.72% of the population. This figure varies from State to State: ACT (3.1%), Queensland (1.8%), Tasmania (1.4%), Northern Territory (0.8%), Victoria (0.6%), South Australia (0.5%) and Western Australia (0.4%).

This report draws upon two sources of quantitative data. The first source is statistics available for the Government, Independent and Catholic school systems in each State (and Territory, hereafter not listed separately on each occasion). This material was gathered by the National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia (NLLIA) and data on Japanese language teaching were



extracted. In addition, we conducted research specifically for this project. The latter research entailed the design and implementation of detailed questionnaires for all teachers of Japanese at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels, interviews with key personnel in various administrative and teaching positions, and the collection of available written documentation on relevant issues.

For the sake of simplicity, the report refers to school systems (even though this may not be strictly correct in the case of Catholic or Independent schools).

---

## **2.2 The Primary Level**

### **2.2.1 Introduction**

Historically the teaching of LOTE's commenced at the secondary school level. Consequently, up until the end of the 1980s there were only a few programs in Japanese or in any other language, for that matter, at the primary level. Statistics gathered from the various Government systems show that this pattern is changing. The type and size of programs vary enormously, but nevertheless some Japanese is now available in all States and in all school systems - Government, Independent and the Catholic - at the primary level.

In order to gather in-depth data on the Japanese programs, enrolments and teacher profiles at the primary level, survey instruments were distributed to 131 schools where a program of Japanese was identified. One of the questionnaires was to be filled in by teachers of Japanese and another by the program's co-ordinator or single teacher of Japanese. The latter contained additional questions. Returns were received from 92 co-ordinators/single teachers and another from eleven teachers. Consequently, the survey reports on the situation in 92 schools. (Not all questions were answered by each respondent and a few completed invalid responses. Hence not all tables add up to 92 schools.)

---

### **2.2.2 Growth of Japanese language programs**

Table 2.1 gives national statistics for enrolments in Japanese at the primary level in 1991. (Five sets of figures are for 1992.) The total of 37,845 is still not a final figure as a few sets of data are missing. On this basis, we could estimate that over 40,000 pupils were studying Japanese in the 1991/1992 period. Some statistics were available from the various systems showing the breakdown according to Year level. These data are given in Appendix 1.

Table 2.1 shows that Queensland has the highest enrolment by far, with over 17,000 pupils studying Japanese. This represents 45% of the national total at this level. No doubt the expansion of Japanese in that State has been due to the implementation of positive policies and the extension of teaching programs in schools. Queensland is followed by Victoria with nearly 9,000, after which the

ACT and South Australia each have over 3,000 pupils. Western Australia has under 3,000 pupils of Japanese, and enrolments in Tasmania and the Northern Territory are lower.

|     | Govt               | Ind.             | Cath.            | All   |
|-----|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|
| Qld | 12933 <sup>1</sup> | 3440             | 819              | 17192 |
| NSW | N/A                | N/A              | N/A              | N/A   |
| Vic | 6176               | 2561             | 244              | 8981  |
| WA  | 1082 <sup>2</sup>  | 916              | 764              | 2762  |
| SA  | 2302               | 921              | N/A              | 3223  |
| ACT | 1791               | 886              | 808 <sup>1</sup> | 3485  |
| Tas | 753 <sup>1</sup>   | 156 <sup>1</sup> | 459 <sup>1</sup> | 1368  |
| NT  | 634                | 149              | 51               | 834   |
| All | 25671              | 9029             | 3145             | 37845 |

Table 2.1  
National statistics on the number of pupils studying Japanese at primary level in 1991 (Source: Curriculum Corporation, 1992)

1. Enrolment for 1992 (1991 figure not available)

2. Years 1-8. Otherwise the figures cover prep and Years 1-6, or 1-7 where appropriate

On the basis of the figures given in Table 2.1, 2.1% of pupils studied Japanese in relation to total primary school enrolments in 1991 (as given in *Schools, Australia 1991*, Australian Bureau of Statistics (1992)). However, there are huge differences on a State basis. At 10.6%, the ACT has the highest proportion of primary students studying Japanese, though it must be remembered that the population of that Territory is small. In Queensland 5.3% of pupils studied Japanese, and it is followed by two smaller States, the Northern Territory and Tasmania, with 3.6% and 2.8% respectively. Victoria and South Australia are below the average with 2.1% and is followed by Western Australia with 1.5% of primary pupils learning Japanese. (Figures were not available for Japanese learners in NSW.) These figures clearly show that still only a small proportion of Australian primary students are learning Japanese. What proportion of Australian primary school pupils are learning foreign languages other than Japanese, is another important statistic but we were unable to calculate it for this particular report.

The Government school systems have the majority of enrolments but this proportion is boosted by the high number in the Queensland system. Catholic schools enrol just over a third of those studying Japanese in the Independent school system. It is also necessary to look at the number of learners of Japanese in relation to total enrolments in each system. In this sense, Japanese is strongest in the Independent system, where, as a proportion of total enrolments at the primary level, learners of Japanese account for 8.6% of pupils. In the Government system this falls to 1.9% and it is lower again in the Catholic system where the proportion is only 0.9%. Nevertheless, variation occurs across States. In relation to total student population, 9.2% of pupils at Victorian Independent schools learn Japanese, this being a far higher proportion to that found in Victorian Government schools and Catholic schools with 2.0% and 0.2% respectively. On the other hand, in Queensland the Government system has the largest proportion - 5.1%, compared to 2.1% and 1.6% in the Independent and Catholic School systems.

A word of caution is in order regarding enrolment statistics. It came to our attention that some of the official statistics on the number of primary schools

teaching Japanese do not necessarily reflect a fully established program. In some cases, for example, a course or an extra-curricular activity run by a voluntary intern may be included (cf. Department of School Education, Victoria, 1992). From this perspective, to report figures for the number of pupils learning Japanese at the primary level is somewhat difficult.

The teachers who responded to our primary level questionnaire, shown in Table 2.2, came from Queensland (38.8%), followed by Victoria (27.2%), South Australia (12.6%), ACT (8.7%) and NSW (7.8%). A few teachers came from Tasmania (2.9%) and Western Australia (1.9%) but no one from the Northern Territory participated in our survey.

| State | No. of respondents | %    |
|-------|--------------------|------|
| Qld   | 40                 | 38.8 |
| NSW   | 8                  | 7.8  |
| Vic   | 28                 | 27.2 |
| WA    | 2                  | 1.9  |
| SA    | 13                 | 12.6 |
| ACT   | 9                  | 8.7  |
| Tas   | 3                  | 2.9  |
| NT    | 0                  | 0.0  |
| All   | 103                |      |

Table 2.2  
State distribution of survey respondents

The greater number of teachers in Victoria in comparison with NSW probably reflects the earlier and wider spread of teaching Japanese at this level there. Respondents also came from the three education systems. Reflecting the distribution of enrolments shown in Table 2.2 above, the majority of teachers (74%) who responded belonged in the Government systems, followed by those in Independent schools (19%) and Catholic schools (7%). This is shown in Table 2.3.

| Type of school | No. of respondents | %  |
|----------------|--------------------|----|
| Government     | 75                 | 74 |
| Independent    | 20                 | 19 |
| Catholic       | 7                  | 7  |
| All            | 102                |    |

Table 2.3  
Respondents by category of school

The findings show that in the schools surveyed, Japanese was being studied in 1992 by 11,165 pupils throughout the country. Table 2.4 displays the number of students studying Japanese as part of the regular curriculum. The majority of schools (79 schools out of 87, or 90.1%) report that Japanese is a part of a set curriculum which means that it must be taken by all pupils.

| State | Prep | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | All   |
|-------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Qld   | 0    | 74     | 101    | 138    | 131    | 125    | 836    | 889    | 2294  |
| NSW   | 55   | 60     | 0      | 132    | 224    | 146    | 68     | 0      | 685   |
| Vic   | 415  | 538    | 591    | 585    | 489    | 622    | 618    | 0      | 3858  |
| WA    | 0    | 0      | 0      | 0      | 34     | 33     | 34     | 34     | 135   |
| SA    | 135  | 267    | 278    | 332    | 385    | 272    | 234    | 209    | 2112  |
| NT    | 197  | 292    | 320    | 323    | 284    | 260    | 254    | 0      | 1930  |
| Tas   | 11   | 11     | 33     | 36     | 37     | 14     | 5      | 4      | 151   |
| All   | 813  | 1242   | 1323   | 1546   | 1584   | 1472   | 2149   | 1136   | 11165 |

Table 2.4  
Number of pupils studying Japanese at the primary level in surveyed schools by State in 1992

The distribution of pupils by category of school is shown in Table 2.5.

| Category of school | Prep | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | All   |
|--------------------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Government         | 631  | 959    | 1025   | 1235   | 1134   | 961    | 1482   | 814    | 8241  |
| Independent        | 65   | 138    | 166    | 251    | 312    | 466    | 469    | 217    | 2084  |
| Catholic           | 102  | 123    | 110    | 60     | 138    | 45     | 198    | 105    | 881   |
| All                | 798  | 1220   | 1301   | 1546   | 1584   | 1472   | 2149   | 1136   | 11206 |

Table 2.5  
Number of pupils of Japanese at the primary level in surveyed schools by category of school

(Note that there is a slight discrepancy between the figures in Tables 2.4 and 2.5. This occurs here (and elsewhere) because respondents to the questionnaire varied in answering all the questions or answering them validly.)

Practically all growth in Japanese at the primary level seems to have occurred since 1988. As shown in Table 2.6, only two out of 79 programs were established before 1988, the remaining programs commencing in the 1988-1992 period. However, 13 co-ordinators did not know the year of commencement at their school, perhaps indicating that these schools had introduced Japanese in an earlier period. Notably, the number of schools newly introducing Japanese peaked in 1991. The reduced growth in 1992 was probably due to a shortage of teaching staff and related moratoriums on the introduction of new programs, as in the Queensland Government system.

| Year of commencement | No. of schools |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 1980                 | 1              |
| 1986                 | 1              |
| 1988                 | 7              |
| 1989                 | 17             |
| 1990                 | 15             |
| 1991                 | 23             |
| 1992                 | 15             |
| All                  | 79             |

Table 2.6  
Year of commencement of Japanese program at the primary level

### 2.2.3 Features of Japanese programs

At some of the surveyed schools, Japanese is only available as an extra-curricular activity, a format which is sometimes the forerunner of a regular program. Such programs were reported by 13.9% of schools (12 out of 86), and are available at different levels at different schools.

Table 2.7 shows that, overall, regular programs in Japanese are available at all levels of primary school, even though the commencement year varies with the school. However, Japanese is most commonly available in Year 6, the lower levels having fewer programs. Some States (Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia) have a seventh year of primary school, where Japanese may also be available.

At a large majority of schools (93.1% or 81), Japanese language is taught with some cultural content (Table 2.8). Only five schools claim to teach Japanese language only. A subject which introduces only culture is not available at any school.

| Level              | No. of schools |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Prep               | 23             |
| Year 1             | 29             |
| 2                  | 34             |
| 3                  | 40             |
| 4                  | 42             |
| 5                  | 46             |
| 6                  | 66             |
| 7 where applicable | 39             |

Table 2.7  
Levels of Japanese available in the regular curriculum (N=90)

| Program type                                             | No. of schools | %    |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------|
| Japanese language only                                   | 5              | 5.7  |
| Japanese language with some cultural content             | 81             | 93.1 |
| Japanese culture subject only                            | 0              | 0.0  |
| Separate Japanese language and Japanese culture subjects | 1              | 1.1  |
| All                                                      | 87             |      |

Table 2.8  
Type of program available

Many of the newly established programs intend to expand the levels at which they teach Japanese in the coming years, but this expansion, plus the introduction of programs at other schools will depend largely on an increased teacher supply. Details on current teacher profiles and teacher education are found in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2). Of the co-ordinators, 37.8% (28 out of 74) claimed that their school had experienced difficulty in the past three years in filling Japanese language teaching positions, either with native or non-native speakers. On the other hand, 62.2% had not experienced such problems. This could have been because they had not had a vacant position recently. Of course, the current survey does not reveal how many schools exist which are unable to introduce Japanese due to a shortage of teachers.

A few schools are involved in curriculum development and in the compilation/production of textbooks or learning materials. The lack of commercially available texts for use as main texts in primary programs emerges from the study. Sixty-one per cent of teachers (53 out of 87) do not use commercially available texts.

Transition to the secondary level is an important matter and our findings suggest that more liaison and planning are necessary. Most primary schools (87.3%) are in areas where Japanese is available at the secondary level (76 out of 87 schools). As shown in Table 2.9, half of the students who proceed to the secondary level are thought to be placed in classes with others who have not previously studied Japanese, while another quarter are in the same classes but are given extra work. This information agrees with the perceptions of secondary school co-ordinators, as reported in Section 2.3.3. A third of the primary schools (52 out of 78, or 66.7%) report having liaised with secondary schools regarding transition.

| Type of school                                                                                                        | No. of schools | %  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----|
| Students are placed in the same class as students who have not previously studied Japanese                            | 45             | 59 |
| Students are placed in the same class as those who have not previously studied Japanese but they are given extra work | 20             | 26 |
| Do not know the policy                                                                                                | 16             | 21 |
| They are placed in a separate class from students who have not previously studied Japanese                            | 3              | 4  |
| They skip a level of Japanese                                                                                         | 0              | 0  |
| Other                                                                                                                 | 7              | 9  |

Table 2.9  
*Transition to secondary school from primary school Japanese programs*

A very pleasing development discovered in our survey was the existence of links between 18 Australian primary schools with schools in Japan. This represents 20% of the schools surveyed. However, a further three claimed to be aiming to set up, or to be in the process of establishing, a school link. This is a means of facilitating real interaction and so is a valuable part of the overall program. The most active kind of contact involved the exchange of letters, either between classes or penfriends, but the exchange of pictures or other materials, such as the children's art or other school work, is also fairly common. Occasionally video tapes of classes, audio tape-recorded songs or books made by the children are exchanged. Group visits to the other country are another form of contact.

## 2.2.4 Conclusion

The development of Japanese language teaching at the primary level presents exciting prospects for the future. Here is an opportunity to provide pupils with an experience in a language which is very different from their own. The cultural awareness to be gained from these very courses will be hard to find elsewhere; for Australians who are facing the twenty-first century this experience will be vital.

The present picture of Japanese language teaching at the primary level is one of rather limited and careful growth. It is probably not as strong as the enrolment statistics suggest. The commencement of programs is very recent and much will depend on support from the State authorities. In some cases such support seems to be forthcoming, but in others there may be insufficient understanding. Given the lack of teachers and available courses, Japanese language teaching may not meet the level of demand and could perhaps fall behind developments in other languages.

## 2.3 The Secondary Level

### 2.3.1 Introduction

As with the primary school level, statistics were gathered from the Government, Catholic and Independent school systems. In addition, questionnaires were sent to 713 secondary schools, covering all schools throughout Australia which were identified as offering a Japanese language course. Of the two types of questionnaires prepared, one was for language teachers, and the other which included an extra section, was for the school's co-ordinator of Japanese. These surveys aimed to obtain quantitative data on the teaching of Japanese. However, special attention was also paid to the backgrounds of teachers and to certain features of the language program. Surveys were returned by 313 co-ordinators and by another 291 teachers of Japanese. Consequently 313 schools were represented in the survey. This response rate shows that the survey covers just under half of those schools teaching Japanese at the secondary level to which questionnaires were sent. In the analysis to follow, totals do not always add up to 100% because of the existence of invalid responses.

### 2.3.2 Growth of Japanese language programs

Table 2.10 shows the national statistics for enrolments in Japanese at the secondary level for 1991. Missing from the total of 74,210 are statistics for the Catholic systems in NSW and South Australia, and the figure for the Government system in Western Australia is incomplete. Accordingly, from this set of figures we can estimate that the total number of students studying at the secondary level in 1991 was approximately 80,000. The enrolment breakdown according to Year level for some of the systems is provided in Appendix 2.

|     | Govt               | Ind.  | Cath.             | All   |
|-----|--------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| Qld | 14418 <sup>1</sup> | 8135  | 6321              | 28874 |
| NSW | 13710              | 1599  | N/A               | 15309 |
| Vic | 5692               | 5721  | 2997              | 14410 |
| WA  | 160 <sup>2</sup>   | 2125  | 755               | 3040  |
| SA  | 2362               | 1008  | N/A               | 3370  |
| ACT | 1378               | 1288  | 1496 <sup>1</sup> | 4162  |
| Tas | 3109               | 554   | 898               | 4561  |
| NT  | 278                | 48    | 158               | 484   |
| All | 41107              | 20478 | 12625             | 74210 |

Table 2.10  
National statistics on the number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in 1991  
(Source: Curriculum Corporation, 1992)

1 Enrolment for 1992 (1991 figure not available) 2 Figure for Year 12 only available

The above Table shows that enrolments in Japanese are strongest in Queensland, covering 38.9% (28,874) of the national total. NSW comes second and if Catholic figures were available, the figure would probably be over 16,000. After Victoria, with over 14,000 enrolments, a big gap is found with the other States. Tasmania and the ACT have over 4,000 students each and South Australia and Western Australia over 3,000. Student numbers are small in the Northern Territory.



In relation to the total number of students enrolled at the secondary level in Australia in 1991 (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1992), 5.8% (74,210 out of 1,288,608) are learning Japanese. Using the statistics given in Table 2.10, the proportion varies considerably across States, regardless of their size. In the ACT, 14.4% of students are studying Japanese and in Queensland and Tasmania, the proportions are 13.9% and 12.3% respectively. There is then a big fall, with only 4.7% of students of the Northern Territory learning Japanese, 4.0% in Victoria and 3.7% in South Australia. NSW is also below the national average at 3.4% and still lower is Western Australia at 2.7%.

Fifty-five per cent of the enrolments (41,107) belong to the Government systems, 28% of students (20,478) are at Independent schools and 17% (12,625) at Catholic schools. Noticeably, in absolute terms, the Independent system is stronger than the Government system in Victoria. The relative proportion in terms of the total enrolments in the three main systems varies. Although the national average of secondary level students learning Japanese across all systems is 5.8%, it is proportionally highest in the Independent schools, with 13.2% followed by Catholic schools at 4.9% and lastly the Government system, with 4.7% learning Japanese. Again, there is considerable variation between States. If we look at the three largest States teaching Japanese - Queensland, NSW and Victoria - we find that the Independent systems in Queensland and Victoria have high proportions of students learning Japanese, 29.5% and 11.1% respectively. However, in Queensland, the Catholic and Government systems also have high proportions, 17.1% and 10.0% respectively. The proportions are much lower in Victoria where the Catholic system accounts for 4.0% and the Government system a mere 1.8%. In NSW, the proportions for the Government and Independent systems are 4.5% and 3.8% respectively.

If we add together the statistics which were available for 1991 for the primary (Section 2.2 above) and secondary levels, the proportion of learners of Japanese in relation to the total school population in Australia was 3.6%. In the Independent schools there are 11.4% learners of Japanese, 2.6% in Catholic schools and 2.2% in Government schools. What clearly emerges is that in the total educational sector the number of students studying Japanese is still very small. Although we agree that the most important figure is the one which shows the total number of students learning all LOTEs, not just a single language such as Japanese, we were not able to gather these data ourselves. The other profile reports will carry comparative figures.

Apart from a very small number of pioneering schools, Japanese language was introduced into the secondary educational level in the second half of the 1960s. It expanded slowly during the 1970s and at a slightly faster rate during the 1980s.

The State distribution of the respondents to the questionnaires (co-ordinators and teachers) which we prepared and distributed is given in Table 2.11. This shows that the largest number of teachers to answer the questionnaires came from NSW (32.5%), followed by Queensland (27.8%) and Victoria (18.9%). Much smaller numbers came from Western Australia (6.6%), South Australia (5.3%), ACT (3.8%), Tasmania (4.3%) and the Northern Territory (0.8%).



| State | No. of respondents | %    |
|-------|--------------------|------|
| Qld   | 168                | 27.8 |
| NSW   | 196                | 32.5 |
| Vic   | 114                | 18.9 |
| WA    | 40                 | 6.6  |
| SA    | 32                 | 5.3  |
| ACT   | 23                 | 3.8  |
| Tas   | 26                 | 4.3  |
| NT    | 5                  | 0.8  |
| All   | 604                |      |

Table 2.11  
State distribution of respondents

Table 2.12 shows the category of schools from which the respondents came. Almost two-thirds belong to the Government school system, followed by 22.2% from the Independent schools. Almost 12% were Catholic school teachers.

| Types of schools      | No. of respondents | %    |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------|
| Government            | 391                | 65.3 |
| Independent           | 133                | 22.2 |
| Catholic              | 69                 | 11.5 |
| Government-Sat. class | 3                  | 0.5  |
| Other                 | 3                  | 0.5  |
| All                   | 599                |      |

Table 2.12  
Respondents to the survey by category of school

Table 2.13 gives the number of students studying Japanese in Years 7 to 12 in each State, according to the information supplied by the co-ordinators who returned our questionnaire. The total for 1992 came to just under 45,000. Since less than half the co-ordinators returned the questionnaires, we can assume that the total number of students at the secondary level throughout Australia is likely to be more than double this number. This estimate is consistent with the figure given above, based on available official statistics.

| State | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | All   |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Qld   | 884    | 5,943  | 2,790  | 2,150   | 77      | 657     | 13101 |
| NSW   | 6,385  | 3,930  | 1,655  | 1,433   | 738     | 424     | 14565 |
| Vic   | 2,711  | 2,336  | 1,622  | 1,006   | 385     | 200     | 8260  |
| WA    | 182    | 1,520  | 787    | 521     | 236     | 110     | 3356  |
| SA    | 55     | 837    | 623    | 407     | 193     | 80      | 2195  |
| ACT   | 607    | 437    | 224    | 117     | 112     | 77      | 1574  |
| Tas   | 387    | 333    | 153    | 110     | 305     | 99      | 1387  |
| NT    | 81     | 95     | 97     | 59      | 7       | 0       | 339   |
| All   | 11,292 | 15,431 | 7,951  | 5,803   | 2,653   | 1,647   | 44777 |

Table 2.13  
Number of students studying Japanese in surveyed schools by State in 1992

As noted above, Queensland and also NSW have expanded Japanese much more quickly than have the other States, suggesting that outside these two States there is a need for further development. From the figures in Table 2.13, we can see that overall the highest enrolments are in the two lower years, with the number decreasing quickly after this. When any figure is quoted stating the number of Australian students of Japanese, it must be remembered that a considerable proportion acquire only minimal competence in the language. Nevertheless, with the overall growth in enrolments, we can expect increasing numbers of students to proceed to the higher levels of secondary school. This is in fact the case. For example, according to statistics from the Victorian Curriculum

and Assessment Board, the Victorian enrolments for the Year 12 examination have increased as follows:

| Year | Enrolments |
|------|------------|
| 1986 | 141        |
| 1987 | 192        |
| 1988 | 226        |
| 1989 | 273        |
| 1990 | 326        |
| 1991 | 363        |
| 1992 | 393        |

Table 2.14  
Enrolments in Year 12 Japanese examinations  
Source: Victorian Curriculum Assessment Board

This increase represents almost a three-fold increase from 1986 to 1992. Even so, the number completing Year 12 in this State is not large and indicates the need for further growth at the upper secondary level.

Figures available elsewhere state that of 21,000 enrolments throughout Australia in Year 12 languages, 5,000 students studied French, about 3,000 German, 2,500 took Japanese and 2,400 Italian (Gossip 1993:20). Although this figure for Japanese is lower than the one quoted above in Section 2.1, it roughly agrees with the figure given in Tables 2.13 and 2.14 (allowing for missing data mentioned in Section 2.3.3). Nevertheless these comparative figures show that the secondary school curriculum is still dominated by the traditionally taught languages of French and German.

The number of students per type of school - Government, Independent, Catholic or Other - is shown in Table 2.15. The Government school systems enrol by far the largest number of students of Japanese, followed by the Independent schools and then Catholic schools. Japanese is also taught a little at other types of schools. As noted above, in relation to total number of students, Japanese is strongest in the Independent system, where it occupies a higher proportion than in Government or Catholic schools.

| Types of school | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | All    |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| Government      | 8,092  | 9,865  | 4,856  | 3,529   | 1,721   | 1,094   | 29,157 |
| Independent     | 2,031  | 3,543  | 2,104  | 1,697   | 765     | 439     | 10,579 |
| Catholic        | 982    | 1,900  | 960    | 557     | 167     | 114     | 4,680  |
| Other           | 129    | 60     | 20     | 20      | 0       | 0       | 229    |
| All             | 11,234 | 15,368 | 7,940  | 5,803   | 2,653   | 1,647   | 44,645 |

Table 2.15  
Number of students of Japanese at the secondary level in surveyed schools by category of school

Table 2.16 shows the year of introduction of Japanese for 258 schools covered in the survey. Fifty-five co-ordinators could not answer this question. As in the case of primary schools, this probably indicates that the programs concerned were not commenced recently.

Prior to 1988, only 22.9% of the schools reported in the survey were teaching Japanese. If we assume that the 55 schools where the answer was not known were established pre-1988, then the figure rises to 44%. It is probably fair to guess that the actual number established before 1988 falls somewhere between 30% and 40%. In any case, there has been a massive increase over the past five years

and there are signs that further growth will occur, given an adequate supply of teachers and adequate planning provisions.

| Year of start | No. of schools | Cumulative % |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1965          | 1              | 0.4          |
| 1967          | 2              | 1.2          |
| 1969          | 2              | 1.9          |
| 1970          | 3              | 3.1          |
| 1972          | 4              | 4.6          |
| 1974          | 1              | 5.0          |
| 1975          | 2              | 5.8          |
| 1976          | 1              | 6.2          |
| 1977          | 2              | 7.0          |
| 1978          | 3              | 8.1          |
| 1979          | 2              | 8.9          |
| 1980          | 4              | 10.5         |
| 1982          | 5              | 12.4         |
| 1983          | 4              | 13.9         |
| 1984          | 2              | 14.7         |
| 1985          | 7              | 17.4         |
| 1986          | 6              | 19.8         |
| 1987          | 8              | 22.9         |
| 1988          | 29             | 34.1         |
| 1989          | 57             | 56.2         |
| 1990          | 45             | 73.6         |
| 1991          | 44             | 90.7         |
| 1992          | 24             | 100          |

Table 2.16  
Year of introduction of Japanese at the secondary level (N=258)

### 2.3.3 Some features of Japanese language courses

Japanese is most commonly introduced at either Years 7 or 8. As seen in Table 2.17, only a few schools start Japanese at a later level. The 11 schools which introduce Japanese in Year 11 are probably found in NSW (and perhaps in Tasmania) where schools offer a special intensive program - the Z course - which covers the secondary curriculum in two years.

| Year level | No. of schools | %    |
|------------|----------------|------|
| 7          | 151            | 50.7 |
| 8          | 113            | 37.9 |
| 9          | 16             | 5.4  |
| 10         | 7              | 2.3  |
| 11         | 11             | 3.7  |
| 12         | 0              | 0    |
| All        | 298            |      |

Table 2.17  
Level at which schools commence Japanese

There is some variation between schools and also between levels with regard to the number and length of classes. Table 2.18 which gives the mean hours per week and also per year shows that the hours taught per week increase slightly with each level, starting at an average of less than 2 hours per week and increasing to an average of over 3 hours in Year 12.

A student who studies Japanese for six years will thus be exposed to approximately 645 hours of Japanese.

| Level | Length of course |          |
|-------|------------------|----------|
|       | Per week         | Per year |
| 7     | 1.89             | 74.5     |
| 8     | 2.36             | 94.7     |
| 9     | 2.53             | 99.8     |
| 10    | 3.09             | 122.6    |
| 11    | 3.20             | 126.5    |
| 12    | 3.21             | 126.4    |

Table 2.18  
*Length of Japanese courses in mean hours*

An argument sometimes heard is that a character-based language like Japanese or Chinese must be studied for about 2,400 hours to reach the equivalent of what could be achieved in far fewer hours for an alphabet-based language. This figure from the US Foreign Service Institute, mentioned in Section 1.3, is spurious and is often used inappropriately to support the argument that Japanese and Chinese are difficult to learn. What the figure shows is that these two languages have different requirements than say French and German. Actual results of the teaching process depend so much on the way students are taught, their age and other factors, that any fixed figure has little validity. What is clear is that prior learning at secondary school, coupled with exchange experience in Japan in the case of some students, in conjunction with a three or preferably four year tertiary course is sufficient to enable students to attain a high level of competence in Japanese.

Probably in line with new policies in some States advocating the compulsory study of languages at the lower levels of secondary school, Japanese is reported to be compulsory at some stage in the case of 190 (63%) schools and not compulsory in 114 (37%) cases. As Table 2.19 shows, it is rare for Japanese to be compulsory after Year 8.

| Year | No. of schools | %  |
|------|----------------|----|
| 7    | 132            | 69 |
| 8    | 123            | 65 |
| 9    | 5              | 3  |
| 10   | 1              | 1  |
| 11   | 0              | 0  |
| 12   | 0              | 0  |

Table 2.19  
*Levels at which Japanese is compulsory*

There is evidence to suggest that Japanese teachers are spending much time preparing materials. Even if this is the case, 90% of our respondents claim that they use commercially available texts as main texts in their language courses. Nevertheless, for all levels from Years 7 to 12, between 73% and 76% of co-ordinators state that teachers are developing materials. Obviously, some of this is probably material to supplement the main texts. Some state Japanese teachers' organisations or other bodies facilitate the exchange of materials between schools, yet much more co-operation between teachers, schools, systems and States would be beneficial.

Some schools offer a general language subject of which Japanese is one component. Out of 286 schools, 42 (14.7%) reported the existence of such a program. As seen in Table 2.20, over half of these 42 are in NSW, and only a small number is found in Victoria or Queensland.

| State | No. of schools | %    |
|-------|----------------|------|
| Qld   | 6              | 14.3 |
| NSW   | 23             | 54.8 |
| Vic   | 9              | 21.4 |
| WA    | 1              | 2.4  |
| SA    | 1              | 2.4  |
| ACT   | 1              | 2.4  |
| Tas   | 0              | 0.0  |
| NT    | 1              | 2.4  |
| All   | 42             |      |

Table 2.20  
*Availability of a general language subject*

The figures in Table 2.20 suggest that the trend towards introducing a general language subject which began some years ago has not become widespread. On the other hand, what emerged from the survey is the tendency in quite a few schools to offer students the choice of a different language in each semester, usually in the first year when languages are introduced. As a result of this policy, at some schools teachers are teaching a LOTE in which they have little competence, be it Japanese or some other language. However, it has been brought to our attention that the trend of selecting different languages is now dropping off in certain States, eg, NSW, as it has been noted that such courses fail to provide students with a worthwhile language experience.

Out of 293 schools, 61 schools (20.8%) claim to offer special language courses (Table 2.21).

| State | No. of schools | %    |
|-------|----------------|------|
| Qld   | 8              | 13.1 |
| NSW   | 28             | 45.9 |
| Vic   | 9              | 14.7 |
| WA    | 2              | 3.3  |
| SA    | 3              | 4.9  |
| ACT   | 3              | 4.9  |
| Tas   | 6              | 9.8  |
| NT    | 2              | 3.3  |
| All   | 61             |      |

Table 2.21  
*Availability of a special Japanese course*

By far the largest proportion of schools offering a special Japanese course is in NSW (28 schools or 45.9%), followed by Victoria (nine schools), Queensland (eight schools), Tasmania (six schools), South Australia and the ACT each with three schools, and Western Australia and the Northern Territory each with two schools. These special courses include an intensive course for Years 11 and 12 (19 schools) and a course in Japanese for native speakers (four schools) (Claremont 1992). Twenty-four schools have some other form of special course.

The management of students who are native speakers or students with prior knowledge is an important aspect of a language program. The presence of native speaker students in Japanese classes was therefore investigated. Problems have been reported for some other languages where relatively large numbers of native speakers have been enrolled, but this does not appear to be the case for Japanese. Of 288 respondents, 95 (32.9%) claimed to have native speaker students who attend Japanese classes, a number which nevertheless was higher than expected. Although co-ordinators were not asked to specify the numbers involved, we could

expect that at most schools the number would be very small. In any case, co-ordinators claimed that the presence of such students did not negatively effect other students in the class. In fact, such students may represent a valuable resource for the teacher, especially when the teacher is a non-native speaker.

The majority of Japanese students are probably exchange students, though a few might be the children of business personnel who are temporarily resident in Australia or else the children of permanent residents. On a State basis (Table 2.22), schools in NSW and Queensland have most of the native speakers (25.8% and 24.7% respectively), followed by Victoria (20.5%) and South Australia (15.0%), with smaller numbers in Western Australia, the ACT and Tasmania. Overall, the proportion of native speakers in the pre-tertiary system seems to be small.

| State | No. of schools | %    |
|-------|----------------|------|
| Qld   | 23             | 24.7 |
| NSW   | 24             | 25.8 |
| Vic   | 19             | 20.4 |
| WA    | 6              | 6.4  |
| SA    | 14             | 15.0 |
| ACT   | 4              | 4.3  |
| Tas   | 3              | 3.2  |
| NT    | 0              | 0.0  |
| All   | 93             |      |

Table 2.22

*State distribution of schools where native speakers of Japanese attend classes*

As far as school categories are concerned (Table 2.23), more than half of these native speakers attend Government schools (53.8%), over a third are at Independent schools and only a small number is found in the Catholic system.

| Type of school | No. of schools | %    |
|----------------|----------------|------|
| Government     | 50             | 53.8 |
| Independent    | 35             | 37.6 |
| Catholic       | 7              | 7.5  |
| Others         | 1              | 1.1  |
| All            | 93             |      |

Table 2.23

*Distribution of students who are native speakers of Japanese across school categories*

Concomitant with the introduction and spread of languages at the primary level is the need for appropriate structures to cater for students at the secondary level who have had prior exposure to the language, as mentioned in Section 2.2.3. More than half of the secondary schools (172 out of 296 schools, or 58.1%) stated that there are primary schools in their area which teach Japanese. This fact constitutes an important new trend, given that in the past few primary schools taught languages. It is not known how many secondary schools are already receiving students who have completed some study of Japanese language. However, when asked about the provisions made for those students who enter with some background in Japanese, over half replied that such students are placed in the same class as those who have not previously studied Japanese (Table 2.24). In other schools some adjustment occurs through the provision of extra work or by the placement of such students in a class separate from the students who have had no previous knowledge. Rarely do students skip a level of Japanese as sometimes occurs in the transition from the secondary to the tertiary level. In some cases the co-ordinator did not know the policy of the

school. More than half the co-ordinators (122 out of 228, or 53.5%) confirmed that their school liaises with primary schools on the matter of transition. This number must include those schools with primary schools in the area teaching Japanese as well as some which do not teach the language.

| Type of provision                                                                                                     | No. of schools | %  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----|
| Students are placed in the same class as those who have not previously studied Japanese                               | 97             | 56 |
| Students are placed in the same class as those who have not previously studied Japanese but they are given extra work | 40             | 23 |
| They are placed in a separate class from students who have not previously studied Japanese                            | 17             | 10 |
| Do not know the policy                                                                                                | 11             | 6  |
| The students skip a level of Japanese                                                                                 | 2              | 1  |
| Other                                                                                                                 | 20             | 12 |
| All                                                                                                                   | 187            |    |

Table 2.24  
Transition to secondary school Japanese courses

One valuable feature of Japanese programs concerns the facilitation of interpersonal contact with the Japanese. An important means by which such contact is enhanced is through sister-school relationships and other exchange arrangements. These arrangements may be one- or two-way. It was pleasing to find that of 300 schools, 132 (44.0%) are involved in such contact. This is particularly high, given the number of schools which have newly introduced Japanese. The data are provided in Table 2.25.

| State | No. of schools |
|-------|----------------|
| Qld   | 31             |
| NSW   | 43             |
| Vic   | 26             |
| WA    | 14             |
| SA    | 9              |
| ACT   | 5              |
| Tas   | 4              |
| NT    | 0              |
| All   | 132            |

Table 2.25  
State distribution of schools with sister-school relationships or exchange arrangements with Japan (N=300)

When broken down on a State basis, NSW is the leader with 43 of the Japanese co-ordinators who responded to the questionnaire claiming that their schools have such relationships. It is followed by Queensland with 31 schools, Victoria with 26, Western Australia with 14, South Australia with nine, the ACT with five, and Tasmania with four schools possessing such relationships. These kinds of initiatives are most worthy of development and support. While all types of schools are involved in such programs (Table 2.26), the Government systems are the leaders with 76 out of the 132 schools (57.6%) having such relationships, followed by the Independent systems (40 schools or 30.3%) and the Catholic systems (15 schools or 11.4%).



| State       | No. of schools | %    |
|-------------|----------------|------|
| Government  | 76             | 57.6 |
| Independent | 40             | 30.3 |
| Catholic    | 15             | 11.4 |
| Other       | 1              | 0.7  |
| All         | 132            |      |

Table 2.26  
*Category of schools involved in sister-school relationships or exchange arrangements with Japan*

It is highly likely that this amount of active contact with the foreign country distinguishes Japanese from most other LOTE in the school curriculum. However, the role which this feature has in supporting the teaching and learning of Japanese does not seem to have been adequately acknowledged to date (cf. Marriott 1992b). For schools in country districts where native speakers of Japanese are not present and the organisation of cultural activities like visits to Japanese restaurants and the like is not possible, the establishment of a relationship with a school in Japan will enrich the language learning environment. Commonly, activities involve the exchange of letters, audio and video tapes and other items, as well as long-term and short-term exchange visits of students and teachers. Through the provision of homestays to visiting groups, involvement of various parts of the school often occurs. One problem raised by teachers concerned the common imbalance of funds available to Australian schools in comparison with the budgets which Japanese schools devote to such causes. Given the increasing desire by Japanese schools to forge these types of relationships, we predict that this type of inter-school and interpersonal contact with Japan will definitely increase.

Schools were given the opportunity to nominate any aspect of their Japanese program which they considered to be outstanding or of interest to others. Responses were received in the following order (Table 2.27): curriculum development (38 schools), publication of textbooks and/or learning materials (31 schools), computer-aided learning (18 schools), technological innovations (10), and other (22). This involvement suggests that teachers are actively engaged in improving and developing the teaching of Japanese. Interest in new developments relating to computer-aided learning and other technological innovations is noteworthy. However, we did come across certain developments using modern technology in conjunction with out-moded teaching content and methodologies. This problem deserves careful investigation and monitoring.

| Feature                                            | No. of schools | %  |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------------|----|
| Curriculum development                             | 38             | 13 |
| Publication of textbooks and/or learning materials | 31             | 11 |
| Computer-aided learning                            | 18             | 6  |
| Technol. innovations                               | 10             | 3  |
| Other                                              | 22             | 8  |

Table 2.27  
*Special features of secondary level Japanese programs*



### 2.3.4 Conclusion

As Neustupný has argued elsewhere, the teaching of Japanese at the secondary level is fully established. Although most of the growth has happened in the past five years, a firm base was established in the two decades prior to 1988. It is very exciting to see a rise in enrolments in Japanese. Yet, as this chapter has shown, growth has not been significant in most States. There is therefore a need to promote further the spread of Japanese at the secondary level and also to implement strategies to increase enrolments in Year 12.

Several stimulating developments are already occurring at the secondary level, especially in relation to the establishment of contact with schools in Japan. In this regard we can expect to see a rise in the number of students and teachers participating in various forms of exchanges. A lot of energy is being devoted by teachers and others to improving support for the teaching of Japanese through curriculum development, the production of materials and use of new technology. Reference is made to some of these issues in Chapter 7.

A critical problem at present relates to the supply of teachers, to be discussed in Chapter 4.

## 2.4 The Higher Education Level

### 2.4.1 Introduction

Of the three first-tier priority Asian languages, Japanese, Chinese and Indonesian listed by the former Asian Studies Council, it is Japanese which has experienced the greatest expansion. Overall, the growth of the tertiary sector in Japanese has been more dramatic than the increase which has occurred at the primary and secondary levels. Viewed from a quantitative perspective, this section will present information on Japanese language in higher education at the undergraduate, Honours and postgraduate levels. Section 2.5 briefly introduces developments in TAFEs.

Data in this section are drawn from the national survey conducted for this report. A detailed questionnaire was distributed to heads of appropriate administrative units and separate questionnaires were sent to all staff teaching Japanese language. The aim of these surveys was to obtain quantitative data on student enrolments and staffing as well as data on teacher profiles and some of the principal features of the Japanese programs. Statistical processing was carried out on the returns from 23 heads (or their representatives) and 127 staff involved in teaching the language. Late returns were received from a further six heads, from which data on the commencement date of the Japanese program and student enrolments were subsequently manually extracted. Other information from these and from the late returns from teachers could not be used. Since the time of the survey, one new institution which introduced Japanese in 1993 has

been identified. The five institutions which did not reply were only teaching a limited program so we can claim good coverage of Japanese programs in this section.

---

### **2.4.2 Availability of Japanese**

As of 1992, Japanese language was taught at 32 higher education institutions in Australia. These are listed in Appendix 3. Consequently, at that time, all except four Australian higher education institutions offered Japanese. In 1993 at least one further institution was added, so the total comes to 33. The University of Adelaide services Flinders University so these have been counted as two programs. Our list also includes the Royal Melbourne University of Technology where the Japanese program, which is located at the TAFE level, services several courses at the University. In two cases (Australian Catholic University and Griffith University) independent programs exist on two different campuses. If these matters are taken into consideration, it could be claimed that Japanese is taught at 32 institutions, with independent programs on a further two campuses. However, teaching on other campuses of some of the multi-campus universities is also likely. Monash University, for example, teaches on three campuses, but is only counted as one because the same unit conducts all the courses. Ballarat University College introduced Japanese in 1993 and other courses which did not come to our attention may have been introduced elsewhere. By the time of the Report of the Review of the Teaching of Modern Languages in Higher Education (1991), Japanese was already the most widely studied foreign/second language in Australian higher education. Our survey shows that it has grown further since that time.

There is much diversity in the administrative units to which Japanese language programs belong (see Appendix 3). In some cases Japanese is grouped with humanities or social science disciplines or with other languages and culture studies. Sometimes it is combined with other Asian languages and/or studies and occasionally it stands as an independent unit. For the sake of simplicity, this report employs the term 'unit' in reference to the administrative unit in which it is located.

---

### **2.4.3 Growth of Japanese**

Table 2.28 clearly shows the pattern of growth which has occurred for Japanese at the tertiary level. Of the institutions which participated in the survey, one established a Japanese program in 1917, eight from 1962 to 1972, nine from 1975 to 1988, and 13 since 1988. Notably, a wide gap exists between 1978 and 1988 when no institution introduced a Japanese program. However, over the next four-year period, 38% of the institutions which responded to the survey began teaching Japanese. (Here, two universities have been counted twice because of independent courses on two campuses.) If we add the five institutions which did not respond to the request for data as belonging to the post-1988 period, out of 34 institutions (32 universities, two with Japanese at separate campuses), Japanese was taught at 16 (47.0%) of the current institutions in the pre-1988 period and

introduced at a further 18 (52.9%) institutions from 1988 to 1992. This figure clearly verifies the growth which has occurred in recent years.

| Year of Introduction | No. of institutions | Cumulative % |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 1917                 | 1                   | 3.5          |
| 1962                 | 1                   | 6.9          |
| 1965                 | 2                   | 13.8         |
| 1966                 | 1                   | 17.2         |
| 1967                 | 1                   | 20.7         |
| 1969                 | 1                   | 24.1         |
| 1971                 | 1                   | 27.6         |
| 1972                 | 1                   | 31.0         |
| 1975                 | 2                   | 37.9         |
| 1976                 | 3                   | 48.3         |
| 1978                 | 2                   | 55.2         |
| 1988                 | 2                   | 62.1         |
| 1989                 | 4                   | 75.9         |
| 1990                 | 3                   | 86.2         |
| 1991                 | 4                   | 100.0        |

Table 2.28  
*Year of introduction of Japanese in Australian higher education institutions (N = 29)*

There are indications that Japanese will continue to be introduced at further institutions or campuses.

#### 2.4.4 Student enrolment

If we wish to measure the size of Japanese programs in higher education institutions in terms of student enrolments, the only truly comparable unit is the Effective Full-Time Student Unit (EFTSU), which is a figure not commonly understood outside educational circles.<sup>1</sup> The Report of the Review of the Teaching of Modern Languages in Higher Education (1991) calculated that Japanese programs in higher education institutions accounted for approximately 2,000 EFTSUs at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels (though there are some inaccuracies in this figure). Other surveys report 'numbers of students enrolled', but such figures often include unsatisfactory comparisons because three or four institutions divide their Japanese language program into written and spoken courses, where the same students often enrol for both courses. Furthermore, some units teaching Japanese language also offer other Japan-related subjects which are then counted with the Japanese language enrolments. Wishing to measure the size of Japanese programs in terms of student enrolments, we endeavoured to obtain from the survey of heads of Japanese units EFTSU figures as well as numbers of students enrolled. The figures supplied by heads of units are presented in Appendices 4 and 5. Unfortunately, not all respondents could supply the figures and in several cases, quite inconsistent figures were given. (Clearly problematic figures have been omitted.)

<sup>1</sup> EFTSU stands for 'effective full time student unit'. However, one EFTSU does not mean one student of Japanese. Since students of Japanese are not normally full time students in the Japanese units (they take subjects in other departments as well) one student counts only as a fraction of an EFTSU. For instance, if a student takes Japanese and three other subjects, he or she counts only as 0.25 EFTSU.

When the huge growth of 100 to 150% in student enrolments occurred in 1988 it was labelled by McCormack (1989) as a *tsunami* 'tidal wave'. While the rate of increase tended to level off after that period for the undergraduate level, overall student load has continued to increase. Table 2.29 summaries numbers of students across institutions at the undergraduate level for 1992.

| No. of students | No. of institutions |             |            |             |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|                 | First year          | Second year | Third year | Fourth year |
| Less than 20    | 2                   | 4           | 6          | 12          |
| 20 - 49         | 2                   | 2           | 7          |             |
| 50 - 99         | 4                   | 9           | 7          |             |
| 100 - 149       | 5                   | 4           | 3          |             |
| 150 - 199       | 4                   | 3           |            |             |
| 200 - 249       | 3                   |             |            |             |
| 250 - 299       | 1                   | 1           |            |             |
| 300 - 349       | 1                   |             |            |             |

Table 2.29  
Student enrolment (numbers) in Japanese language at the tertiary level in 1992(N=22)  
(Three doubtful figures have been omitted from the Table)

Table 2.29 shows that of 23 institutions, eight institutions have less than 100 students studying Japanese at first year level; there are between 100 and 250 students at 12 institutions and over 250 at two others. As we would expect, enrolments are less at the second year level, but are still over 100 at eight institutions. At the third year level, ten institutions have enrolments above 50, with three of these over 100 students. The most dramatic decrease is between third year and the fourth year, which up until the present has been the Honours year. The problem of the small Honours year is discussed below. What the above figures on student enrolment do not adequately reveal is the enormous growth which has occurred in recent years in Japanese programs, particularly at the lower levels. We can predict that enrolments in the higher years, especially third year, will increase as the flow-on occurs.

The total enrolment figures given in Appendix 5 for the undergraduate and postgraduate levels in Japanese add up to 7,467. Given that the total higher education enrolment in Australia in 1992 was 559,365, the number of learners of Japanese was a mere 1.3% (and of this, 1.4% at the undergraduate level). However, given the gaps in our figures, we estimate that the actual enrolment in Japanese was between 10% to 20% higher, falling between 8,213 and 8,959. An approximate figure of 9,000 students is probably quite realistic. Even a figure of 9,000 is only equivalent to 1.6% of the total student population in the higher education sector. The EFTSU figure for undergraduate Japanese language alone, not including Japan-related subjects, came to 1,530 (Appendix 4), but several significant figures are missing. A figure of over 2,000 is likely.

The recent growth of the undergraduate enrolment has been supported by an increase in the number of fee-paying Asian students who elect to study Japanese. Certain reports have identified the existence of demand from Asian students for Japanese (Australian 25/11/92), a fact which has been confirmed in our survey. A recent paper reporting a case study of one institution emphasised the multi-ethnic composition of Japanese classrooms (Fan 1992). At the first year beginners' level, of 152 students surveyed, 64 or 42.1% were Australian and another 9 (5.9%) were non-Australian born native speakers of English. Seventy-two Asian students constituted 47.4% and were drawn from 13 countries or regions. Hong Kong Chinese, Malaysian Chinese, Koreans, mainland Chinese and Taiwanese

accounted for 58. It is important to note in this regard that most institutions do not have native speakers of Japanese in their undergraduate courses (cf. below).

### 2.4.5 Honours and postgraduate levels

An important finding which emerged from the survey findings was the small size of the Honours and postgraduate programs. Half of the institutions which responded offer a fourth year Honours program and three others have plans for its introduction in the near future. However, the small student enrolment is striking. Of a national enrolment of 48 students in Honours in 1992, eight institutions have between one and four students, two have between six and ten, and one institution has 14 students. These numbers may vary slightly from year to year, but what is surprising is the relatively low enrolment figure, given the expansion at the undergraduate level in general. (Opportunities for work, either in Japan or Australia, may largely explain this phenomenon.) In all cases the Honours program consists of coursework and thesis, and in nearly all cases, Honours in Japanese is available either independently or jointly with another unit.

In this and in previous sections of the chapter, it has been shown that growing numbers of Australians are gaining exposure to Japanese at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels. However, unless there is a marked increase in enrolments at the Honours and postgraduate levels, the Australian educational system will not be able to produce graduates who have sufficient proficiency to use Japanese in those vocational and professional situations where a high level of Japanese is required. Unfortunately, previous reports have paid little attention to the teaching of Japanese at the Honours and the postgraduate levels.

As in the case of Honours, it is the institutions with well-established programs which have developed to the postgraduate level. The newness of over half the programs in Japanese accounts for the current situation. Table 2.30 presents data on the number of institutions offering postgraduate programs.

| Types of programs | No. of institutions | % of total |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Graduate diploma  | 9                   | 39.1       |
| Masters           | 11                  | 47.8       |
| PhD               | 10                  | 43.5       |

Table 2.30  
*Institutions with postgraduate programs in Japanese (N=23)*

The components of these programs are shown in Table 2.31.

| Program type          | No. of institutions |         |     |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------|-----|
|                       | Graduate diploma    | Masters | PhD |
| Thesis only           | 0                   | 7       | 10  |
| Thesis and coursework | 3                   | 9       |     |
| Coursework only       | 9                   | 4       |     |

Table 2.31  
*Type of programs available at the postgraduate level*

Postgraduate programs are available at 15 of the 23 institutions surveyed. Nearly half of these offer a Graduate Diploma, Masters, PhD or a combination of these. Some institutions offer specialist postgraduate programs. These include:

MA in Japanese Interpreting and Translation (University of Queensland)  
 Graduate Diploma of Arts/MA in Japanese Business Communication (Monash University)  
 Graduate Diploma of Arts/MA in Applied Japanese Linguistics (Monash University)  
 Graduate Diploma in Japanese for Professionals (Swinburne Institute of Technology)  
 Graduate Diploma Arts (LOTE) (Edith Cowan University)  
 Postgraduate Diploma in Arts (LOTE) (Edith Cowan University)  
 Graduate Diploma in Interpreting/Translation (Deakin)

Although not a Graduate Diploma, the Graduate Certificate in Language Education offered by the University of Adelaide is designed for teachers of Japanese.

Over-all student enrolments at the postgraduate level are low. Table 2.32 provides data on the main units offering the language (and in some cases also area studies) courses. Where thesis work is involved (all PhD and some Masters programs) the focus may be Japanese language or some other area of Japanese studies. As a result, postgraduate students may also be enrolled in other discipline units, such as History, and be specialising in Japan. It was impossible to obtain details on students spread out in this manner.

| No. of students | No. of institutions |         |     |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------|-----|
|                 | Graduate Diploma    | Masters | PhD |
| 1 - 4           | 1                   | 3       | 4   |
| 5 - 9           | 2                   | 5       | 3   |
| 10 - 19         | 1                   | 3       |     |
| 20 - 29         | 2                   | 1       |     |
| 30 - 39         | 1                   |         |     |
| 40 - 49         |                     |         |     |
| 50 - 60         | 1                   |         |     |

Table 2.32  
*Numbers of students enrolled at the postgraduate level*

As shown in Table 2.32, the number of enrolments in Graduate Diploma programs is the most substantial. At three institutions (Monash University, Swinburne University of Technology and the Northern Rivers campus of the University of New England), students enrolled in either a Graduate Diploma or MA can undertake either advanced studies in Japanese, or else study undergraduate level language. This provision has facilitated the retraining or upgrading of primary and secondary teachers by allowing them to complete an award qualification (cf. Chapter 4). In order to increase the access by teachers and others to language studies, flexibility of regulations in this way is of considerable importance.

Overall enrolment in Masters programs tends to be very small or moderate. Enrolments at the PhD level are also low. Seven institutions have fewer than nine students each. In total, the survey respondents listed 30 students enrolled in PhDs in 1992, but as noted above, students may belong to other units as well.



The postgraduate level currently attracts a small number of students from Japan (Table 2.33). Such students come to study specialist courses like the Applied Japanese Linguistics (teacher training) stream at Monash or the Japanese Interpreting and Translation program at Queensland. Obviously there is more scope for development here.

| No. of native speaker students | No. of institutions |         |     |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----|
|                                | Graduate Dip        | Masters | PhD |
| 1 - 4                          | 3                   | 4       | 2   |
| 5 - 9                          | 1                   | 2       | 1   |

Table 2.33  
*Number of native speakers of Japanese at the postgraduate level*

Given that half the institutions offer either Graduate Diploma, Masters or PhD programs, the low level of student enrolments indicates that there is under-utilisation of available programs and specialist staff. Notably, ten institutions report the facility to offer PhD supervision, yet the enrolment at half of these is zero. Although a few more students are likely to be enrolled in an area of Japanese Studies in another unit, the overall number is depressingly small. Given that Japanese language and area studies are taught at 32 Australian institutions, a postgraduate cohort of this size cannot support the current, yet alone future, needs of academic staffing requirements. Nor can this number adequately provide the public and private sectors with expertise in Japan and Japanese language.

## 2.4.6 Some features of Japanese undergraduate programs

### 1. Length of programs

Classes in Japanese language are occasionally only scheduled three or four times a week, but five, six or seven hours of class per week is common. This pattern is similar from first to fourth year and only decreases, minimally, at higher levels. The academic teaching year is commonly 26 or 28 weeks in length (with a mean of 27 weeks). In general, attendance at Japanese classes involves 162 hours per year, thus totalling 486 hours over three years. If an Honours year is added, the figure rises to 648 hours. (This contrasts with the figure of approximately 645 hours for six years of study at the secondary level.) Allowing for individual variation, by the end of the first year or by the middle of the second year the university student will normally reach approximately the same standard as achieved by secondary students at the end of their secondary education in Japanese. Although the research literature is not conclusive on the effect of age on second language acquisition (cf. Singleton 1989; Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991:154), it can be argued that the rate of acquisition of certain aspects of the foreign language increases with age. Of course, with increasing age, other variables also come into play.

On completion of a good four-year Honours program, especially if combined with prior study at the secondary level and with some in-country study, it is possible

for Australian learners of Japanese to achieve a high level of competence in Japanese. It is therefore extremely disappointing to see constant reference in the media and in other reports by influential academics and other spokespersons to a set of figures on the number of hours needed to achieve mastery of a variety of languages. These figures, used in the way which has become fashionable, are quite meaningless, and responsible proponents of language learning are urged to avoid the perpetuation of the misuse of such figures.

## **2. Specialised language courses**

In addition to general Japanese language courses, five of the institutions also offer specialised Japanese language courses. Here, Business Japanese is the most common specialisation.

## **3. Double or combined degrees**

Double or combined degrees in which Japanese may be included have become more common in recent years. Over three-quarters of the universities offer double or combined degrees, where the most common forms are Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Law (eight institutions), or a Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Commerce (seven institutions), Economics (five institutions) or Business (three institutions), or a combination of these. Others include a Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science (four institutions), Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Engineering (two institutions), Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Music and Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Teaching (one each).

It is now very common for students in other than the home faculty to be able to study Japanese. At a number of institutions students from any of the other faculties can study Japanese as an elective. For example, Science or Business students may be allowed to study one or two Japanese subjects. Sometimes the language can be studied for three years, but often it cannot. In contrast, the provision of combined or double degrees allows for a full major to be taken in the language and the program may possibly be supplemented by taking subjects which deal with Japan's economy, society or culture.

## **4. Japan-related subjects**

In addition to Japanese language programs, Australian universities offer a wide array of non-language, Japan-related subjects, though there is considerable variation among institutions. Japan-related subjects may be offered by the same administrative unit which offers the language or these subjects may be available from other units within the university. Some of these subjects were previously listed in an earlier report on Japanese Studies in Australia (Australia-Japan Research Centre 1989). It appears that some institutions which have newly established Japanese language courses have not given adequate consideration to the introduction of complementary Japan-related courses.

## **5. In-country study**

Nearly all institutions have formal or informal exchange arrangements or in-country programs which allow their students to study in Japan. In 1992 the



Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee up-dated a list on the links which various Australian higher education institutions have with Japanese institutions. Only three of the newly established programs have not yet established any connections of this type. Twenty-two institutions report exchange agreements or arrangements with between one to eight Japanese institutions, and two other institutions were in the process of establishing schemes.

A small number of institutions report access to scholarship money from various Australian or Japanese sources, or a little institutional support, but others state that all costs of study in Japan are borne by the students. Given that studying and living in Japan is expensive and that self-funding is necessarily a strong deterrent, much more support is necessary. Although a few scholarships are available, these are insufficient to support the number of potential applicants.

In the past, tertiary institutions sending fourth year students to study in Japan were co-ordinated through a committee, and for a number of years funding was received from the Australia-Japan Foundation. However, approximately three years ago the Foundation decided to give priority support to the secondary level, thereby spreading its support to a greater number of recipients. What is patently clear is that advanced levels of competence can only be achieved at the upper higher education level. Neglect of this level thus requires rectification. Adequate funding is vital.

In 1992 a new scheme was implemented by the Australian National University of a year in-country for undergraduates. Following the model of a program introduced for China by Murdoch University, 15 students who had completed second year were placed at Japanese universities where they studied Japanese language courses as well as taking a few other courses, and completed a project. Henceforth this year in-country will be part of a new four year Asian Studies degree at that university. Murdoch University also places students in Japan for six months or a year and they undertake Japanese language courses only. Other universities such as Edith Cowan University and the University of Wollongong are planning the implementation of a similar year-abroad scheme which will lengthen the undergraduate course by one year.

A recent initiative of the Australian Government, University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP), has been launched to promote exchanges between universities in the region. Government-to-Government talks have been held concerning the promotion of greater activity in exchanges between Australia and Japan, allowing us to predict that there will be more development of various kinds of inter-country study.

Depending upon their arrangements in Japan, Australian universities may be able to place their students in appropriate advanced Japanese language courses or in other types of programs. Monash University, for example, arranges a six-month program for its Honours students at its Monash Tokyo Centre. This program has been in existence for over 20 years and provides students with intensive language coursework and supervision of their thesis work. Griffith University has connections with a number of institutions, several of which offer Japanese language courses and others which do not. One of its exchanges is specifically arranged for Arts/Law students and involves several months of work experience

in a Japanese law firm. The University of Queensland has arrangements with several interpreting and translation schools in Japan. The University of Sydney over the past two years has organised a group of Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Engineering students to spend three weeks in Japan (Yasumoto 1992).

Over the past two years La Trobe University has selected students who have completed second year to attend a two and half month intensive course at a Japanese university during the December-February period. At present, this course is not counted for credit in their undergraduate degree, but the students who perform sufficiently highly on a test upon return may be able to skip a level and proceed to the third year by taking a higher level course. This plan thus allows accelerated language learning. Similarly, the University of Wollongong has organised a summer program in Japan for students between first and second years. There seems to be much scope for replicating these types of schemes, though insufficient funding is a restraining factor for students and institutions.

One important recommendation is that an investigation should be made of the various exchanges and other study programs undertaken by Australian students in Japan, together with an evaluation of the benefits of different kinds of study. Particular attention should be given to the comparative advantages of intermediate or advanced level students studying Japanese language courses (for foreigners) or attending regular Japanese university courses.

#### 6. Management of students with prior competence

Occasionally students with native or semi-native competence seek to enrol in a Japanese course. Students in the latter category may have been born in Japan but have spent their period of formal education in Australia. Others may have been born of Japanese parents in Australia, or else have one parent who is Japanese. Eleven institutions report the presence of these students in undergraduate language classes. However, in 1992 the numbers involved were minuscule, with three institutions, having one, three or four students respectively, and one institution, two students. Two of these institutions report that only semi-native speakers are accepted, and after assessment of proficiency they are placed in an appropriate advanced level language class. These two institutions report that native speakers are advised to enrol in Japanese studies courses. Only one university has a number of native speakers in its courses, approximately 15 in 1992. These students attend all second and third year classes, except for the conversation class. In the vast majority of cases, then, Japanese courses at the tertiary level do not experience the problem of native speakers.

Of much greater significance at the tertiary level is the fact that increasingly students come with varying backgrounds in Japanese. An earlier report on Japanese language teaching in Australia (Australia-Japan Research Centre 1987:19) identified the failure of quite a few tertiary institutions to provide streaming at the first year level for beginners and non-beginners, and that wherever streaming was provided, the groups were often merged in the following year. A few of the well-established programs devised satisfactory streaming procedures quite a few years ago for students completing Year 12 Japanese at secondary school and for those who had spent up to a year in Japan as an exchange student. However, in recent years the diversification among the beginners' group seems to be increasing, with zero beginners only making up a

portion and others coming with various amounts of previous study or contact with Japanese. This is another important topic for further investigation.

Twenty-two institutions report that students with background knowledge of Japanese, eg, Year 12 or exchange experience, enrol in their language courses, and that different strategies are used to accommodate such students. The most common procedure (13 institutions) is for students to commence first year in a stream appropriate to their level of Japanese. The next most common way (nine institutions) is for students to skip a year and commence at the second year level. At least five institutions allow their students to reduce the number of years they study Japanese in this way. Consequently, students can complete a major in two years, instead of the normal three years. One problem with this scheme is that the advantage students possess at the beginning of tertiary study is lost by the time they complete their degree. The opportunity to produce graduates with a particularly high level of competence in Japanese is thus wasted. Institutions with these policies are urged to reconsider this issue. So too are the institutions which encourage students with previous knowledge of Japanese to take other subjects during their first year, thereby interrupting their language studies for one year.

Institutions are fairly spread as to whether they have one, two or three levels of courses at the first year level, as shown in Table 2.34. Although all except one institution mentioned having students with background knowledge of Japanese, six institutions have only a beginners' level subject, though one of these will introduce two streams at the first year level in 1993. This number includes some institutions which directly place students with advanced proficiency at a higher year level. It is noteworthy that six institutions have the flexibility to place students at three levels, depending upon their proficiency levels. At institutions where different levels are available for the same year, the typical pattern is to mix students from different year levels, if they possess the same level of competence in Japanese.

| No. of levels                                                                  | No. of institutions | %    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------|
| One - beginners only                                                           | 6                   | 28.6 |
| Two - beginners, and post-year 12/ exchange students                           | 8                   | 38.0 |
| Three - beginners, post-year 12/exchange students and a further advanced group | 6                   | 28.6 |
| Other                                                                          | 1                   | 4.8  |
| All                                                                            | 21                  |      |

Table 2.34  
Levels of Japanese course at first year

It is disappointing that although different streams may be in place at the first level, a tendency exists to merge the streams in later years. Twelve institutions report that merging occurs. This merging is most frequent at the second year level, involving seven institutions; three institutions merge groups at the third year level, and one at fourth year. Only five institutions do not practise merging, either because students directly commence at the second year level, or in the case of a few institutions, the different streams are maintained throughout.

## 7. Research, course development and other special contributions

Table 2.35 illustrates that numerous developments take place in relation to Japanese programs. Over half of the institutions are involved in curriculum

development, eight are producing or publishing textbooks or learning materials, and eight are conducting research into language learning and teaching. Three also hold regular language teaching seminars. Six institutions are involved in computer-aided learning developments and two in other technological innovations. A few institutions offer intensive courses (usually over summer) on either an award or non-award basis, or they offer other types of non-award courses, eg, teacher refresher courses. Off-campus (distance or external) Japanese programs are delivered by two institutions. Monash University is currently producing a three-year distance course which can be taken either at Monash or delivered from other distance centres or other universities. The first and second years are already being taught and the third year course will commence in 1994. Other institutions list as special features their year-in-country programs, the provision of regular in-service courses for teachers, the development of retraining courses for teachers, the development of computer teaching and word processing training, and a 'studies' approach where students can study specialist courses in Japanese literature and history.

It is indeed pleasing to see such a range of interests being pursued. Given the fantastic technological developments which are now taking place, it is good to note the involvement of a number of institutions in relevant projects and experimentation. Obviously more is needed, as is spread of information among the institutions.

| Feature                                       | No. of institutions | %    |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|------|
| Curriculum development                        | 12                  | 54.5 |
| Publications of textbooks/ learning materials | 8                   | 36.4 |
| Research into language learning/teaching      | 8                   | 36.4 |
| Computer aided learning                       | 6                   | 27.3 |
| Non-award courses                             | 4                   | 18.2 |
| Intensive courses for credit                  | 3                   | 13.6 |
| Non-award intensive courses                   | 3                   | 13.6 |
| Regular language teaching seminar             | 3                   | 13.6 |
| Off-campus courses                            | 2                   | 9.1  |
| Technological innovation                      | 2                   | 9.1  |
| Other (year-in-country etc)                   | 4                   | 18.2 |

Table 2.35  
Special developments or features of programs (N = 22) (multiple answers possible)

#### 8. Staff research

The research and other activities of individual staff and their units is often enhanced by a close connection with a Centre of Japanese research or teaching or both. These Centres are:

Australia-Japan Research Centre (ANU)  
 Japanese Studies Centre (affiliated with Melbourne, Monash, La Trobe and Swinburne Universities)  
 Key Centre for Asian Languages and Studies (Griffith University and the University of Queensland)  
 Japanese Economics and Management Studies Centre (University of NSW)  
 Japanese Teaching Centre (Griffith University Gold Coast)

Numerous institutions also have beneficial connections with other kinds of centres.

The research activities of Japanese staff have been impressive. Though there are various measures by which research activity can be gauged, one measurement involves the attraction of internal or external research or course development funds. Of 21 institutions, 16 (76.2%) indicated that staff had received such funding over the past three years. In many cases, details were provided on grants to a number of staff members. Nevertheless, despite one of the Australian Research Council's professed priority areas being Asian Studies, far too little funding support is available from this body.

The need for course development in Japanese language teaching to be supported by research is vital, and in this regard several centres and departments are actively engaged in this kind of work. Some of the recommendations arising from the present report will hopefully stimulate further research projects.

#### **9. Assistance in the retraining of pre-tertiary teachers**

A number of the Japanese units have been directly involved in recent training/retraining initiatives to increase the number of primary and secondary teachers of Japanese. Thirteen institutions have been involved through different means. At Monash University, postgraduate regulations were changed in 1989 to permit the study of undergraduate Japanese language by practising teachers within a Graduate Diploma in Applied Japanese Linguistics. This procedure has since been further broadened to encompass the Masters course as well, and it is no longer restricted to current or prospective teachers of Japanese. Over recent years quite a few teachers have been granted study-leave by the Victorian Department of Education to pursue the study of Japanese in this way. The Nathan campus of Griffith University organised a special year-long intensive course in 1990 and 1991 to train teachers of Japanese, and in 1992 the University of Queensland offered a part-time training course for practising teachers. The University of Adelaide offers a Graduate Certificate of Language Education. In 1991 the University of Central Queensland conducted a LOTE refresher course. Teachers have also retrained at the University of Newcastle. Curtin University of Technology has scheduled late afternoon classes, thereby making them accessible to teachers, and at Edith Cowan University Japanese staff have co-operated with the Faculty of Education in assisting in the training of teachers. The University of New South Wales has introduced a new Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education program. Swinburne University reports that a number of teachers have enrolled to learn Japanese either in the undergraduate course, or in the Graduate Diploma in Japanese for Professionals which introduces Japanese from the beginners' level. The Mercy campus of the Australian Catholic University reports that students studying second year Japanese will qualify as trained primary teachers. The University of Canberra also provides after-hours options in the normal units and currently is in the process of planning a Graduate Diploma with the Faculty of Education. Deakin University has a very small Japanese interpreting and translating course and it has also been connected with the training of LOTE primary teachers. At Griffith University, Gold Coast, the Faculty of Education in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts trains primary and secondary teachers, with the Japanese section offering language and methodology courses. A summer school was offered to provide the



opportunity for upgrading of language qualifications. La Trobe University reports no special measures but comments that each year a number of teachers enrol in the language course. Other initiatives include summer schools for credit at Monash University over the past four years, and short, non-degree refresher courses which are funded by the Australia-Japan Foundation. In summary, then, a large number of tertiary institutions have been responsive to changing needs and in some cases, they have initiated changes themselves. The continuation of these initiatives will be necessary for some time, given the severe shortage of teachers at the primary and secondary levels.

#### 10. Future plans of Japanese units

A number of common themes characterise the stated plans of the institutions for further expansion of their Japanese programs. Some of the recently established programs, eg, those at the University of Wollongong and the Mercy campus of the Australian Catholic University will develop higher year undergraduate levels. The University of Canberra is considering the introduction of double major degrees and the University of Adelaide will expand its teaching at Flinders University. Others, like the ANU, La Trobe University, University of Adelaide and University of Sydney plan to expand the number of Japan-related subjects offered by their units, as noted above. An alternative four-year degree is currently being planned at Edith Cowan University, and the Northern Rivers campus of the University of New England plans greater use of computer technology.

An Honours program will be introduced by Murdoch University in 1993 and at La Trobe University in 1994. Edith Cowan University is also developing an Honours year, to be followed by MA and PhD programs with a linguistic orientation. Swinburne University planned to commence a MA (Japanese) in 1993. The University of Queensland plans new courses and programs at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and the University of Melbourne will review and expand its Honours program and postgraduate offerings. La Trobe University is considering offering postgraduate studies some time in the future.

The priority awarded to teacher training in general is further witnessed by the planning at the University of New England for a Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education to include the subjects Introduction to Japanese Applied Linguistics and Introduction to Japanese Teaching Methodology. ANU also plans the establishment of a program to train teachers. Monash University plans consolidation of its undergraduate and postgraduate programs in business communication and applied linguistics. Several institutions are also considering major structural changes and rearrangement of some of the language teaching sections like Japanese.

#### 2.4.7 Some problems at the high education level

During the past five or so years there has been a conscious promotion of Asian languages in Australia, stimulated in large part by the Federal Government through the Asian Studies Council (Marriott 1992c). This promotion coincided

with other developments in the perception of international relations and with a period of intensification of Australian-Japanese personal contacts. It is therefore not surprising that student and other community interest has centred upon Japanese, resulting in an enormous growth at all levels of the education system. While teacher shortage has also characterised the higher education level, the problem has not been as serious as that at the secondary level because greater use is made of native speakers from Japan.

However, the problem of growth has produced, to some extent, negative effects whereby the capacity of some Japanese teaching units is stretched to the limit. A number of problems, resulting from the rapid growth of enrolments at the tertiary level, should be mentioned here. Most of them are connected with staffing budgets, the size of classes, the teaching load of staff and the relationship between teaching Japanese and teaching about Japan.

### 1. Staffing formula and budgets

Australian tertiary institutions are funded on the basis of the number of students. In the DEET Relative Funding Model, languages are weighted at 1:6 at the undergraduate level (and 1.8 for higher degrees and 2 for research degrees). Replication of the DEET formula of 1:6 for languages would translate into a staff-student ratio of 1:13.75. Although universities are not obliged to use the same weightings as used in the DEET model, it is customary for them to fund faculties/schools according to different formulas and these, in turn, may give preferential treatment to some departments and treat others less favourably.

In many institutions the formula for funding language departments is more favourable, following the tendency found in the DEET model. In our survey we found that the units teaching Japanese were funded on the basis of different formulas. Some of them were favourable (1:9), others very unfavourable (1:19). Details are given in Table 2.36.<sup>2</sup>

| Staff/student ratio | No. of institutions |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 : 9               | 2                   |
| 1 : 10              | 1                   |
| 1 : 11              | 1                   |
| 1 : 12              | 2                   |
| 1 : 13              | 2                   |
| 1 : 15              | 4                   |
| 1 : 16              | 1                   |
| 1 : 19              | 2                   |

Table 2.36  
Staffing formula for Japanese language courses

Where is the problem? The fact is that other departments at the same institution, such as departments of history, sociology or English are much better

<sup>2</sup> Let us suppose that a Japanese teaching unit is staffed on the basis of the formula 1:10, which is considered to be a favourable formula and that there are 200 first year students, each worth 0.25 EFTSU. The unit earns from the 200 students 50 EFTSU, for which it is allocated five members of staff. Let us further suppose that the unit has a program which consists of one lecture and five tutorials per student, and that it will split students for the lecture into two groups, and for each tutorial into 20 groups (ten students per group). There will be a need for 102 teaching hours. Accordingly, each of the five members of staff will have to teach more than 20 hours per week. This load is unacceptably high for the level and intensity of tertiary teaching, examining and other duties of staff, which normally include course development and research.



off, even if their staffing formula is less favourable. The reason is that they teach subjects with a much smaller number of hours, normally three or at the most four and with a much higher proportion of large group classes, usually in the form of lectures. In Japanese, the number of teaching hours per week remains high, at five to seven hours throughout the major.

When staffing formulas were originally devised, there were no languages taught from scratch. When the formula was revised, decision-makers probably acted on the basis of guesses and did not realise that the 'favourable formula' was far from being a realistic figure to help the teaching of languages like Japanese and Chinese. With money being in short supply, no faculty in Australia has agreed to adjust the formula to staff such units in a way comparable with the staffing of other departments. Admittedly, at some universities, other subjects are also being staffed inadequately.

It is true that in recent years extra federal funding has been made available to institutions for the expansion of Asian languages and studies in the negotiation of their student load. However, clearly, the institutions in turn have not channelled sufficient financial resources to the Japanese units coping with an immense growth in student demand. How universities can best cope with this growth is an urgent matter for consideration.

Japanese teaching units have developed at least four methods of dealing with the situation: increasing the number of students per tutorial, imposing quotas on student enrolments, increasing the proportion of casual staff, and increasing the teaching load of staff.

## 2. Size of classes

None of the ratios currently employed by Japanese teaching units allow proper teaching of language classes, and as the number of first year students in particular has risen to high levels, there is much frustration among staff as well as among students. Previous reports on language courses have made recommendations for staff-student ratios which were far too high. In a non-cognate language and, furthermore, when a non-alphabetic script is employed, the amount of basic language work which must be covered is far higher than that required in languages closer to English. Consequently, high class contact hours in tutorials are needed, necessitating that the staff-student ratio be low.

To verify the existence of extra large classes, heads of units were asked to state the average number of students in Japanese language tutorials at the first year level. As revealed in Table 2.37, nearly two-thirds of the institutions have language tutorials with 20 or more students. Classes with 25 students or above also exist. One university has abolished tutorials.

Staff from one large department report that teaching materials designed three years ago based on pair and group work in tutorials up to a size of about 15 students did not work well in classes with double the number of students. They suggest that new course development is necessary, assuming that tutorials will now contain 20 to 25 students. Sometimes computer-assisted learning is advanced as one solution. Neustupný has elsewhere supported the greater use of native speaker assistants in the classroom as well as more utilisation of native speakers

from the Japanese community resident in Australia (1989). Now is certainly the time when new teaching strategies are urgently required.

| Class size<br>(No. of students) | No. of institutions | %    |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------|
| 12 students                     | 1                   | 5.0  |
| 13 students                     | 1                   | 5.0  |
| 14 students                     | 2                   | 10.0 |
| 15 students                     | 3                   | 15.0 |
| 20 students                     | 7                   | 35.0 |
| 25 students                     | 4                   | 20.0 |
| 26 students                     | 1                   | 5.0  |
| 30 students                     | 1                   | 5.0  |
| Mean                            | 19.7                |      |

Table 2.37  
Average number of students in first year Japanese tutorials (N=20)

### 3. Quotas

Some institutions have imposed quotas to control the number of students selecting Japanese. In 1992 nine institutions out of 23 (39.1%) had such a quota. These quotas were justified in terms of a 'shortage of funds' or 'budgetary and staffing reasons'. One head explains that a quota of 120 for the beginners' first year stream was introduced 'to reduce the unrealistic stressful workloads placed upon limited staffing resources to enable a greater focus on improving the quality of teaching and research'. Actually, the problem is a structural one whereby incoming funds are limited and radical restructuring of subject areas is usually very difficult for faculties to achieve. Another head writes that a quota system exists for the 'survival of the less popular subjects. If Japanese takes in more students somebody else misses out'. The current growth in students at the pre-tertiary levels will guarantee that Japanese will continue to expand much further.

### 4. Use of casual staff and increased teaching loads

Other methods used by administrative units to cope with the growth in student numbers involve increasing the teaching load of staff, and more especially, increasing the proportion of casual staff. Details on staffing will be provided in Chapter 4.

In summary then, the growth in Japanese at the tertiary level is not without its problems. Already another negative effect of this growth is apparent in the form of a backlash from other disciplines and administrators in several universities where attempts are being made to weaken the position of Japanese language and studies, despite continuing growth in student demand.

### 5. Teaching Japanese and teaching about Japan

It has been claimed above that, despite the growth in Japanese language studies at the tertiary level in recent years, equal attention has not always been given to the development of Japanese studies, either as courses to complement the language programs of students or as courses in their own right. There has been considerable debate in the profession about the importance of studies programs (McCormack 1989; Neustupný 1989) and about the location of these - either within the language units or else within other discipline-based units, eg,

history. What is most important is that students incorporate them more into their study plans. The findings of this report suggest that even when institutions offer a range of courses on Japan, students majoring in the language may be unable to complete many of these due to restrictive regulations at their institutions, usually, it seems, when these courses are offered by different units. More planning is thus needed to rectify this problem.

The data gathered on the secondary school teachers show that insufficient numbers have been able to complete Japan-related courses as well as the language. It is essential that language teachers be able to draw upon knowledge of the society and culture of the country they teach about, and thus we recommend that greater emphasis be placed upon the study of Japan-related courses.

---

## **2.5 The Technical and Further Education (TAFE) Level**

### **2.5.1 Introduction**

In comparison with gathering data for the primary, secondary and higher education sectors, it was more difficult to obtain information on TAFE institutions. This is largely because the institutions are not centralised and information on the availability of Japanese language programs could only be obtained by making contact with each institution. As with the other levels, questionnaires were distributed to TAFE institutions teaching Japanese, one to be completed by the co-ordinator and another by individual teachers. Replies were received from 17 co-ordinators (or their representatives) and from a further five teachers. Since this is such a small sample, only a brief analysis has been undertaken.

---

### **2.5.2 Types of programs and size of enrolments**

As noted above, it has been estimated that 3,000 students were studying Japanese at TAFE in 1992 (cf. Section 2.1). Two distinctive types of programs are offered by these institutions. One consists of certificate or award courses and the other can be classified as non-award or fee-for-services courses. It is possible that the above figure of 3,000 students covers both types of programs. In this section on TAFE, we are interested mainly in the award courses, as the non-award courses are similar to some of those dealt with in Section 2.7 of this chapter.

In our TAFE sample, eight institutions offered certificate/award courses in Japanese. The average enrolment at the first year level was 64 students; only one institution had more than 80 students at this level. Second year courses were available at five institutions, with an average enrolment of 27 students. Three of the eight institutions offered a third year of Japanese, and the average enrolment rose to 35 students. Overall, then, this sample shows that not a great many students are undertaking an extensive study of Japanese as part of an award

---

course at TAFE. Since the majority of students are studying only a first year course, we can predict that their competence remains at an elementary level.

---

### 2.5.3 Features of the programs

Commonly TAFE institutions offer general language subjects only, but sometimes they have specialised language subjects. Tourism or hospitality courses are the most common types of specialised courses.

Although 12 out of 15 institutions receive students with prior knowledge of Japanese, most let these students skip one or two semesters, thereby reducing the total number of years they study Japanese. As mentioned in Section 2.4.6 above, it is a pity that students are unable to build upon their previous study more effectively.

In contrast with the higher education level, only two out of 17 institutions organise in-country programs where their students are able to study in Japan. This aspect certainly needs improvement. More planning to develop connections with specialised tourism and hospitality courses in Japan, perhaps in conjunction with work placements there, deserves serious consideration. During our research, we became aware of only one institution, in South Australia, which had developed a vocationally-oriented exchange program.

In response to whether students sometimes continue their study of Japanese at a higher education institution after completion of an award course, seven institutions indicated that this is possible, in contrast with four where this does not occur. Only two TAFE institutions have teaching links with a tertiary institution.

Beginning in 1993, several TAFE institutions have commenced the development of specialised courses in tour guiding. This is in response to a serious need within the tourism industry for an increase in the number of Japanese-speaking tour guides. The development of specialised courses of this nature is a very positive one and it is hoped that the design of curriculum, staffing and implementation of courses will be such that students will be able to attain a sufficiently high level of proficiency in Japanese. There are indications, however, that insufficient resources are often allocated for the task to be achieved satisfactorily. Specialised training for employees working in the retail sector is an area for which courses do not yet seem to be available, even though a need has been identified (cf. Marriott 1991).

---

### 2.5.4 Conclusion

Given the increasing pressure on higher education institutions to allow credit transfer for courses taken at TAFE, some of the findings from our survey are disturbing. The qualifications and backgrounds of the majority of TAFE staff, described in Section 4.5, in general do not match those of the staff in the Higher

Education level who participated in our survey. Furthermore, in a number of ways, certain developments, such as links with Japan, seem to be further advanced at the secondary level than at TAFE. The lack of development of TAFE award courses is further evidenced by lack of adequate management of students with prior competence and lack of development of courses at the upper levels. More work is possibly also needed in the area of curriculum design, although we could not specifically investigate this aspect. Clearly, the contribution which can be made by TAFE institutions in the training of Australians to work in the tourism and hospitality industries is very important. Although there has been some development of Japanese for Special Purposes at this level, more effort is required.

TAFE staff do not benefit from the support structures which exist at the secondary school level, in terms of Year 11/12 examinations, teachers' associations which primarily look after the needs of secondary school teachers and their courses, and, where available, State advisers and so forth. Nor do the staff possess the expertise which is sometimes, though not always, existent at the Higher Education level in the teaching of Japanese. Far greater networking between TAFE course planners and teachers with other sectors of the educational system will be necessary if the teaching of Japanese at this level is to be developed in an extensive manner.

## 2.6 Ethnic Schools

As we shall outline in Chapter 7 of this report, the Japanese community in Australia is not very large. In 1986 the number of those who were born in Japan and lived in Australia was just over 11,000 people. Even more important to realise is the fact that the majority of these people are not immigrants but 'sojourners' (cf. Brisling 1981; Neustupný 1985a), comprising mostly personnel of Japanese companies who are stationed in Australia for a few years and then moved to work at other destinations or to return to the parent company in Japan. The number of permanent residents of Japanese origin has always been small and only some of them have played a role in the development of Japanese ethnic schools.

In the 1960s the number of part-time Japanese schools, invariably Saturday schools, appeared to cater for the needs of Japanese residents. All of them were managed by Japanese Societies (*Nihonjinkai*) of the cities concerned and received advice and support from the Japanese Ministry of Education (*Mombusho*). However, in the 1970s and more so in the 1980s it became obvious that children of Japanese sojourners who returned to Japan after a period of stay in a foreign country were seriously disadvantaged compared with those who received all their schooling in Japan. One of the main factors in this issue is the character of the Japanese writing system which requires very extensive exposure to input, impossible if the child lives outside Japan in a completely foreign environment.

Because of this experience the Japanese Government moved to support the establishment of full-time Japanese schools, and currently such schools are operating in Sydney (from 1969), Perth (from 1978) and Melbourne (from 1986).

These schools are fully incorporated into the *Mombusho* system and teach curricula basically identical with those taught in Japan. They cover the six years of the primary school and three years of the Japanese Middle School (Junior High School). Senior High School tuition is not available. The teachers are almost entirely professional school teachers from Japan. The Sydney school also runs 'international classes' for Australian students who wish to enhance their study of Japanese. Japanese language programs for Australian students are also offered at the Japanese School in Perth. In addition to the full-time schools, part-time schools are located in Adelaide, Brisbane and Canberra. These operate mostly on Saturdays. Enrolments in the full-time schools in 1992 (Japanese students only) are shown in Table 2.38. The figures reflect the size of the Japanese communities in the three capital cities.

|           | Primary | Secondary<br>(junior high school) |
|-----------|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Sydney    | 323     | 81                                |
| Melbourne | 89      | 28                                |
| Perth     | 33      | 6                                 |

Table 2.38  
Enrolments in full-time Japanese schools in Australia (1992)  
(Source: Embassy of Japan, Canberra)

The establishment of full-time schools left the minority of Japanese residents, mainly permanent residents who wanted their children to receive education in Australian schools, in a difficult position. It was mainly for this reason that in Melbourne the former part-time school was reorganised, now without much connection with the Japanese authorities, as the Melbourne International School of Japanese. It serves as a means of maintaining Japanese language competence of Japanese children who attend Australian schools during the week. This school also offers international classes to children of partly Japanese origin or to those who have no Japanese connection at all.

Apart from the international classes which have limited enrolments, the full-time Japanese schools have so far had virtually no effect on the provision of personnel proficient in Japanese for Australia. They mostly cater for sojourners who return to Japan after having spent a few years in Australia. The English proficiency of these children does not normally develop beyond the elementary level.

However, brochures available from the Sydney and Melbourne schools mention that between 1986 and 1991 at least 14 students who completed the Junior High School opted not to return to Japan and entered Australian secondary schools. Because of the character of Japanese university entrance examinations, these students are likely not to return to Japan for their tertiary studies and they will probably receive their tertiary education in Australia. It can be expected that they will become bilingual in Japanese and English and take, in the future, an active part in Australian-Japanese relations.

The part-time schools have small enrolments and suffer from problems in language teaching orientation. While many of the students show signs of limited competence in Japanese, with Japanese being their second language, the methods applied are those of first language teaching. This type of school can sometimes stop a radical language shift away from Japanese, but it cannot fully maintain



the language and develop it. Similar problems may be encountered by ethnic schools in other languages, but the character of the Japanese writing and specialised vocabulary exacerbate the problems.

Due to the fact that students in these schools communicate within their families in Japanese, by the end of the first three years of the secondary school their competence in Japanese is still very high - compared with Australian students who did not possess the same advantage. As mentioned above, some of them enter the Australian education system at the senior secondary level and develop very high proficiency in both Japanese and English. Should it be possible to improve the efficiency of language instruction at these schools, they could become important suppliers of bilingual personnel with substantial Australian experience.

The part-time Japanese schools in Australia, especially the Melbourne school which is not dependent on Japanese curricula, could become the breeding ground for the establishment of English-Japanese bilingual schools modelled on the European experience. Such schools offer programs which are taught in both languages and produce graduates who are bilingual in the traditional sense of the word (total bilingualism). The present system of international classes is far removed from this system. Of course, the establishment of such schools, probably one or two in each State, should be seen as a supplement to, not a replacement of, the existing forms of Japanese language study.

## 2.7 Other Courses

Other courses, mostly short-term non-degree courses and individual tuition, are offered both by the public sector (universities, colleges, the secondary sector, adult education and community centres) and by private organisations. Especially after the 1988 'tidal wave', private schools of Japanese, often consisting of a single teacher, have mushroomed throughout Australia and it is virtually impossible to undertake an extensive survey of such institutions. They appear and disappear and many do not respond to requests for information, perhaps because the managers and/or teachers do not feel confident of their standards.

As a part of this project we attempted to survey Japanese courses in Melbourne. Addresses and telephone numbers were taken from a list of Japanese course providers made available by the Victorian Council of Adult Education, advertisements in the *Saturday Age*, telephone directory and the publication called *Melbourne Agenda* (November 1991). Seventeen providers were surveyed by telephone and fax. It is characteristic of the fluid situation within this sector of Japanese language teaching that out of these 17 providers, four had discontinued teaching Japanese and two said they would only start teaching the language in 1993. Some private schools were reluctant to participate in the survey, obviously because they did not want to disclose details that would make their organisation appear small, struggling or unqualified.

Enrolments varied greatly between 450 and six students. Institutions affiliated with universities (Monash University, University of Melbourne, La Trobe



University) had the largest numbers of students. One of the institutions had 250 students at Level 1, 130 at Level 2 and 70 at Level 3. However, on the whole, most enrolments seemed to concentrate at Level 1, after which a radical drop occurred and new students were recruited.

The majority of courses consisted of one class of one and a half to two hours per week over 10 to 15 weeks. One institution was teaching a non-degree course which required six hours of class work per week. Most classes were held in the evening but the Victorian School of Languages was also teaching on Saturday mornings.

The text used most often was *Japanese for Busy People, Book 1* which consists of 30 relatively short lessons, ten lessons normally being taught within one course. This is a suitable book on which a general non-degree course can be based, but without considerable supplementation it could hardly be described as ideal. Other texts included Alfonso's *Japanese Book 1* and *Konnichi wa*, books which are suitable for children but not for adults.

The majority of teachers in the survey were native speakers of Japanese, with some teaching experience but minimal formal qualifications. Non-native speakers were employed to teach some of the courses. One co-ordinator said that they were mostly people who had lived in Japan and had experience in teaching adults.

We know from informal contact with teachers and from previous surveys that many adults who enrol in non-degree Japanese courses in Melbourne are people who intend to visit Japan on business, who work for Japanese companies in Australia, have family contacts with Japan or who are seriously motivated. Interestingly, prospective travel to Japan for pleasure, especially group travel, does not seem to contribute many students. The variation range is of course wide, and there are students who consider Japanese courses as a means of enjoying their free time. However, on the whole, it would be unwise to underestimate the motivation of those who enrol in short non-degree courses of Japanese.

Although many of the existing courses appear satisfactory from the point of view of traditional language teaching, they do not satisfy the needs of all students. This can be concluded on the basis of the radical drop-outs reported in our survey after the first ten to 15 weeks and from informal evidence given by former teachers. Three areas of inadequacy should be mentioned:

1. The courses are too general, and do not provide competence for most of the needs expected to occur in the case of the students.
2. The students are interested, apart from pure linguistic knowledge, in learning how to communicate with the Japanese and in learning about Japanese culture and society but these needs are not met.
3. The strategies and techniques needed for learning languages (so-called language learner strategies) are particularly under-developed in this group of learners. Many students have no clear expectations of how much time will be needed, and how they should study outside of the classroom, and many teachers are unable to provide guidance concerning suitable learning strategies.

The area of adult education in Japanese has so far been given totally insufficient attention by the Government and other planning authorities. There is demand for short courses with particular objectives, such as business trips to Japan, working with Japanese colleagues in Australia, helping children who are studying Japanese, and many others. Such courses must be developed, a process that cannot be served by lay teachers or semi-professionals. Courses must include a large communication and sociocultural component which, we know, is demanded by the students. And attention must be given to guiding students in their studies. Teachers must be trained with particular reference to the needs of these students and courses.

While large amounts of money have in the past been pumped into language teaching within the secondary system, this important sector has remained without much attention.

The same is true about private tuition. There is some need for co-ordination centres which would alleviate the task of personnel departments in companies and public service for individuals who need private tuition in Japanese. However, the most pressing task is to develop model courses and train teachers. Such training, needless to say, must be radically different from the training of secondary or primary level teachers of Japanese.

---

### 3 QUALITATIVE CHANGES IN JAPANESE LANGUAGE STUDY

Along with quantitative adjustments, outlined in Chapter 2, Japanese language study in Australia during the last three decades has also witnessed significant qualitative changes. These changes followed the development of language studies in general, but in view of the newness of the discipline were perhaps even more conspicuous in Japanese than in the case of some more traditionally taught languages.

#### 3.1 From Grammar Translation Teaching to the Audiolingual and the Post-Audiolingual Paradigm

The **grammar translation** paradigm of language teaching is not merely a historical artefact. Among participants in Japanese language study many still remember its days. For example, the first Year 12 examination in Japanese in Victoria, introduced in 1972, was under the domination of the grammar translation paradigm. The textbook prescribed was the *Naganuma Reader*, comprehension was checked through translation, grammar was examined in short unconnected sentences, and there were 'culture' questions of the type usual in the traditional Japanology (history, literature, etc) approach.

Some universities used predominantly grammar translation procedures well into the 1970s, although most of those institutions which introduced Japanese in the 1960s proceeded directly to the application of more modern methods.

The influence of the **audiolingual** paradigm was felt in Australia, but it was not as strong as in the United States. However, its elements were embedded in Anthony Alfonso's textbooks for tertiary and secondary levels. Although they were not the only secondary level textbooks of Japanese produced in Australia in this middle period, they played an important role in the teaching of the language.

The development of **post-audiolingual** trends commenced in Australian teaching of Japanese at the beginning of the 1970s. The old generation of teachers, some of them deriving their knowledge of the language from war-time military courses, remained dedicated to the Grammar Translation approach, but the new generation showed a distinct inclination toward post-audiolingual communicative teaching. This development was based directly on their own social and communicative experience, as most teacher training (Diploma of Education or equivalent) courses were still operating under a strong influence of the audiolingual methodologies.

One of the earlier post-audiolingual courses in Australia was the Victorian HSC course, introduced to schools in 1985. It was based on an analysis of the current and future use of Japanese by students, was oriented towards the use of Japanese in Australian as well as Japanese settings, and introduced students not only to grammatical but also to sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence. The strong post-audiolingual character of this course was undeniable. In this respect it was

later joined by other courses, such as *Kimono* or *Issho ni*, and *Yoroshiku*, discussed in Chapter 7. Although no existing courses, whether their materials are published or not, satisfy all criteria for being classified as fully post-audiolingual, all of those produced recently possess very strong post-audiolingual features.

Two main problems exist concerning the character of methodologies used in Japanese language studies in Australia. One of them is the implementation of the courses. We know that a course syllabus itself does not guarantee that its implementation by teachers will respect the paradigm under which it has been produced. We know that in fact post-audiolingual courses are sometimes implemented in an audiolingual way. A second issue not to be forgotten is that the transition to post-audiolingual thinking about language study has been less conspicuous in the case of tertiary institutions. Some of them may be using approaches of earlier paradigms by choice, but the approaches of some others are dated due to a lack of information about contemporary theories of language teaching.

The question of evaluation of the methodologies is important. Teachers select grammar translation, audiolingual or post-audiolingual approaches on the basis of their own internalised teaching strategies. However, they are also influenced by the student population, which consciously or unconsciously demands a course which agrees with their learning strategies, as acquired through experience in other subjects or due to their overall social experience. If there is a discrepancy between the teacher's strategies and the learners' strategies, who should accede? We believe that it is the teacher who should try to accommodate the students' expectations rather than the other way round. A course which runs against the students' expectations will not be a successful course.

Furthermore, we must accept that the range of objectives and activities of a post-audiolingual course covers a wider field than allowed by the grammar translation or audiolingual framework. A grammar translation approach will normally lack attention to the spoken language while an audiolingual course will play down the importance of the written language and concentrate on sentence patterns rather than on competence in interaction in authentic situations. Of course, there are also post-audiolingual courses which are very limited in their reach. However, this is the property of the particular course, rather than the property of the paradigm, which provides possibilities for expansion unavailable in the older frameworks.

We can thus say that the present trend towards adopting post-audiolingual approaches is to be welcomed and supported. Of course, it is not true that all Japanese language teaching will be post-audiolingual. Also, there is variation within the post-audiolingual camp, with some approaches close to the original notional-functional framework, with teachers for whom communication means simply use of language forms, and with courses that pay only unsystematic attention to sociocultural competence. However, on the whole, the development is highly promising.

### 3.2 From Language Teaching to Interaction Teaching

One of the mainstays of post-audiolingualism in language study is concern not only with grammatical but also with sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence. While changing its paradigm, Japanese language study in Australia has moved from unilateral dependence on the study of grammar to the concurrent study of 'culture'. At the same time the importance of active interaction, against passive understanding, has been emphasised.

The slogan of including sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence does not imply that grammatical competence should be left out. Distance between English and Japanese grammatical competence is substantial. Due to the presence of the 'pitch' accent, the pronunciation is very different. The morphology of the noun (with obligatory use of particles) and of the verb and adjective is relatively regular, but complicated. The word order is different and this affects not only words in the clause but also the order of clauses. The Japanese lexicon is very extensive and difficult to master. Perhaps the Japanese system of writing has attracted most attention: it is in fact the most complicated system of writing of all places and times.

It is true that more than average time is needed to master the system and actually use it, and the size of the task should not be underestimated. On the other hand, the difficulty must not be overemphasised. Growing numbers of foreigners are mastering the Japanese language, in courses offered either in Japan or overseas. Besides, it is exactly the complication of the system that presents an excellent opportunity to understand how human language works. There is much that recommends the Japanese language and makes its acquisition a very important issue for Australia.

However, language alone is not the remedy for the problems of Australians in interacting with the Japanese. The study of sociolinguistic competence is another necessary component. It has often been subsumed under the heading of communicative competence, a fact that some teachers have taken to mean just the use of language forms in realistic situations, rather than in isolated sentences which make no situational sense. However, others required that the study of communicative competence goes back to the original models of Hymes (1962, 1964) and pays attention to rules which govern who communicates with whom, when and where, about what and through what media. This is the sense in which the term sociolinguistic competence is used in this report.

In the case of the study of Japanese interaction, perhaps the most prominent trend is to include the study of politeness, not only in terms of learning the special polite forms of verbs, but including the selection of topics, non-verbal ways of expression and many other aspects. For example, almost all Japanese courses now include instruction on how to bow appropriately. Elements of Japanese etiquette, verbal or non-verbal, are now included in most courses developed and offered in Australia. As in the case of grammatical competence, there is still much to be done. However, the system is clearly on the right track.

Another example of teaching communicative competence in the wider sense of the word is the inclusion of treatment of suitable content of conversation in the curriculum, ie, what to say as well as how to say it. For example, almost any

Australian course in Japanese now deals with strategies which allow learners to respond correctly when they are praised for their Japanese by native speakers of Japanese. There is no need to say that strategies such as this remained outside the scope of Japanese language teaching during its audiolingual period.

Furthermore, in addition to linguistic and sociolinguistic competence, language teaching of the last three decades has commonly accepted the necessity to deal with the teaching of 'culture' together with the teaching of language. In this term everything except grammatical competence was included, so that sociolinguistic competence (which concerns non-grammatical components of communication) and sociocultural competence (which concerns parts of culture which are not primarily communicative) remained undistinguished.

In Japanese language study in Australia these two categories are sometimes combined and sometimes distinguished. However, the categorisation itself is not of primary importance. What matters is whether both types of 'culture' are in fact catered for. Regrettably, our survey has disclosed that teachers of Japanese often lack training and confidence to deal with sociocultural issues (see Chapter 4).

An issue that can be expected to surface in the not-so-distant future is who is responsible for the teaching of Japanese sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence which does not accompany language teaching. Neustupný (1989) has argued that it is necessary to distinguish at least three types of Japan-literacy, depending on which of the three competencies are required.

Japan-literacy 1 targets virtually the whole population, except those who frequently communicate with the Japanese, and requires mainly sociocultural competence that will enable people to interpret news about Japan, the behaviour of Japanese companies in Australia and so on. Some sociolinguistic knowledge is useful.

Japan-literacy 2 is needed by those who are in frequent but not permanent contact with the Japanese and communicate with them through the medium of English. While communicating with the Japanese, they require knowledge of Japanese sociolinguistic strategies as used in contact situations and, of course, sociocultural knowledge. Some knowledge of the language is useful.

Japan-literacy 3 is closest to the traditional picture of Japanese language teaching. Apart from sociocultural and sociolinguistic knowledge, it also includes linguistic knowledge.

If we apply this theory of Japan-literacy to the Australian situation, we can immediately recognise that Australia has so far heavily invested in Japan-literacy 3. In view of the fact that there is still an insufficient supply of graduates who can occupy positions in which permanent and regular contact with the Japanese is necessary, Japan-literacy 3 as an objective is well suited to the tertiary sector. However, it is questionable whether there is a need for large numbers of people with a relatively low level of Japan-literacy 3, such as is inevitably produced at secondary or primary/secondary levels. The necessary conclusion then is that much of the primary and secondary teaching should rather be oriented towards Japan-literacy 2 or, more suitably, Japan-literacy 1.



At the same time future developments in this area will no doubt encompass the design of special courses in Japan-literacy 2 and 1 for adults. There is little sense in teaching a high-ranking public servant, whose contact with Japan will be intensive but limited to a short period of time, how to distinguish between the particles *ni* and *de*. This is typically a case for Japan-literacy 2, with some, but limited, teaching of the language. Similarly, a number of people in the community would greatly profit from a course in Japan-literacy 1 (ie, basically sociocultural competence only), but such courses are currently unavailable.

### 3.3 From University Study to the Primary Level

One feature distinguishing the study of Japanese from the study of the traditional school languages is the level at which the study traditionally commenced. While in French or German the study of language normally began at the secondary level, the traditional starting level in Japanese was the university. Even today, many of those connected with Japanese language teaching in Japan, Europe and America find it difficult to break away from the image of Japanese language studies as a enterprise for young adults. This is also how the study of Japanese started in Australia.

However, apart from Korea and Taiwan, which had a special relationship with Japan until the end of WWII, Australia was the first country in the world which liberated itself from the traditional image and introduced Japanese as a normal secondary school subject. Roots of this development can be found in the pre-war period, but the generalisation of the process came much later. Our survey documented the growth of Japanese language teaching at the tertiary level in the 1960s, followed by expansion to the secondary sector in the 1970s (see Chapter 2).

A number of reasons for this development can be identified. First, some school systems allowed for the introduction of subjects at the discretion of the school itself; there was no need for initiation of the move by Departments of Education. Secondly, in the 1970s economic and personal exchanges with Japan were already well established. Thirdly, the first students who graduated from Japanese departments at Australian universities, established in the mid-sixties, were now ready to take up appointments as teachers. There was also a steady supply of native speakers of Japanese who were suitably qualified to take up teaching positions. Finally, the perception of the world had changed or was changing: Australia started considering itself a neighbour, if not a part, of Asia. It was natural that the languages of the Asian neighbours would be taught in schools, in the same way as the languages of Britain's neighbours (French and German) were taught in British schools. Japanese was the language of one of the most visible neighbours north of the Australian continent. Of course, it was not alone, with Indonesian being initially its more successful partner.

The development of the teaching of Japanese at Australian secondary schools was a most impressive change in the map of Japanese language teaching worldwide. However, a closer assessment shows that although it is not



negligible, Japanese still remained a long way behind the European languages. This situation was not corrected until the end of the 1980s.

It was also at the end of the 1980s that Japanese, together with other LOTEs, was transferred to the primary level. As our survey has shown, this new development, while having achieved a strong start, still needs consolidation. It is conceivable, and not undesirable, that in the future the study of Japanese (as well as of other languages) will be offered widely at the kindergarten level. Much thinking on objectives and functions will need to back this process. We certainly do not want to teach kindergarten children how to hand out business cards - a topic included in an overseas textbook of Japanese for the primary level.

The title of this section, 'From University Study to the Primary Level', confirms the importance of the inclusion of the lower levels of education within the teaching of Japanese but it does not imply that we would be recommending the move of the focus of the system downwards. It must be accepted that for the purpose of interaction, the tertiary level will remain of utmost importance.

We cannot but describe as absurd the belief that if Japanese is taught over eight or ten years at the primary and secondary level, with time allocation as it is at present, this course of study alone could produce high school graduates whose Japanese would be up to the level of freely reading Japanese texts or conducting business negotiations. Students on graduation from university would possess somewhat more knowledge if they had commenced Japanese study at the pre-tertiary level, in comparison with those who did not. On the basis of available theories of language acquisition we can predict that they would acquire better pronunciation and somewhat better grammar, but we cannot expect that the rate of acquisition would reach the level usual in older students (Ellis 1985; Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991). This does not matter because benefits other than interactive efficiency derive from the study of Japanese.

For interactive efficiency, the combination of some primary/secondary study with a good tertiary course will remain the most economical method of reaching a high interactive level in Japanese. Our survey has indicated that apart from the extension of Japanese language teaching downwards, another process is taking place: the extension of the teaching upwards, into postgraduate teaching. Whether such postgraduate studies take place in Australia, in Japan, or in a combination of the two locations, this is and will remain the method for achieving very high levels of Japan-literacy 3.

### 3.4 From Native to Contact Situations

Another trend which can be clearly seen in the development of Japanese language studies in Australia over the past two decades is a departure from the view that we should teach students 'to speak like the Japanese speak to each other'. It has been widely accepted in Australia that it is necessary to teach how foreigners interact with the Japanese. A learner will normally have to reach the level of semi-native competence before the interactive situation will resemble a situation in which only native Japanese speakers participate. In other words, we are

preparing learners how to deal not with native, but with contact situations. Moreover, it has also been accepted that only some of the contact situations will take place in Japan: initially most will be located in Australia.

Compared with traditional Japanese language teaching this was a significant breakthrough. Traditional courses worked on the assumption that all participants were Japanese, or 'almost' Japanese, and did not acknowledge the fact that learners did interact with the Japanese in overseas locations. Even if a Mr Smith appeared in the course, he was normally speaking fluent Japanese and differed little from other (Japanese) speakers in the situation.

In the 1970s travel to Japan was scarce. However, as ties between Australian and Japanese schools developed in the 1980s, some syllabuses came to emphasise both Australia-located and Japan-located situations. Today, the principle seems to be widely accepted.

As our survey of graduates shows, a large percentage of former students in fact do use their knowledge of Japanese in Australian settings (see Chapter 6).

The other point mentioned above concerns the internal structure of situations. As we know from language acquisition studies, learners of Japanese normally participate in encounters with the Japanese as foreign speakers. Their status in such encounters differs significantly from that of native speakers. They produce deviant behaviour (linguistic, sociolinguistic as well as sociocultural), they note the deviance, evaluate it, and frequently try to adjust (correct) it. This also happens in native situations, but to an incomparably lesser extent. On the other hand, native speakers in contact situations identify deviations and co-operate with foreign speakers on solving the problems. Both they and foreign speakers suffer not only from misunderstanding messages but also from misrepresenting their intention, personality and from more than a usual amount of fatigue. Some, but not all, features of these situations have been summarised in literature under the name of 'foreigner talk' (Clyne 1981; Skoutarides 1986).

Obviously, the situation is completely different from native situations in which only native speakers participate. Learners must be guided on how to deal with the special problems which characterise contact situations: how to monitor their speech, how to adjust (correct), how to ask for assistance, how to elicit 'foreigner talk' or how to restrict it, how to prevent miscommunicating about their own personality and misunderstanding that of their native partners, and how to deal with their fatigue. They must know what types of problems normally occur in contact situations and how to prevent them.

This range of issues presents a completely new agenda for Japanese language teaching. The agenda has been gradually tackled and implemented in Australia.

### 3.5 From General to Specialised Courses

Japanese language teaching in Australian higher education started in general courses which were designed to teach the same 'Japanese language' to everyone. The whole course took three or four years and students who did not finish all three or four subjects obtained a section of the knowledge, but not necessarily a section that made sense on its own.

When the teaching of Japanese started at the secondary level, many courses were allocated the content of the first year university subject. This fact was criticised as the 'provision of cannon fodder for the universities' in the first half of the 1970s and subsequently amended. In subsequent developments, secondary courses were given their own objectives and were allowed to make sense on their own. However, there is still a long way to go towards making each part of the course a special unit in itself - a unit that would make sense for some limited but particular purpose, even if the student does not continue the study of Japanese. We believe that this purpose can only be achieved if the courses move closer to Japan-literacy 1 or 2 curricula and if more specialisation of the content occurs.

The issue of specialisation is important. There is always a need for a strong general component in each course. Learners will meet the Japanese as individuals, at parties, and in all kinds of social contact. On the other hand, the remaining situations may depend on the students' interests and their future occupations. Teaching for these situations must be specialised. Some graduates will work in Australia-Japan economic relations, others will be active in tourism, law, engineering, medicine or other fields. They need a good deal of competence in these special areas.

In Australia specialised language courses started at Griffith University where in the early 1980s a special course for scientists was introduced. In other countries, such as Britain or East Germany, special Japanese courses for scientists had been developed already in the 1960s. Another development in this direction was the interpreting/translation course at the University of Queensland. The language tackled in this course was the language of a number of situations, but what was special about the course was how the language was used - for interpreting or translation rather than for direct communication. The end of the 1980s saw the development of Business Japanese courses at many institutions.

One warning must be voiced here. Not all combined courses (eg, Japanese/law, Japanese/economics, Japanese/engineering) are necessarily courses in which the Japanese component is specialised. Some such courses simply use a general language course combined with a standard discipline course. The student may not be exposed to any specialised language at all and may not be given any insight whatsoever into the area of his/her specialisation as it applies to Japan. Many Arts/Law courses have traditionally been like this: no legal Japanese and no Japanese law. However, even this situation is now being slowly rectified. It is interesting to note that specialisation is being introduced at the secondary level as well. There is a distinct need for secondary courses which specialise in tourism situations, such as the NSW course. In this case, because of the specialisation, much can be achieved within the time available, and results can be produced which are directly applicable in practice.

### 3.6 From Classroom Teaching to External Learning Situations

Here, as in the previous sections, the title does not intimate that the earlier pattern (classroom teaching) is being or should be abandoned in favour of the more recent one (teaching in external settings). What we want to say is simply that in addition to the original situation, additional new patterns have emerged.

Some 20 years ago all teaching was conducted by the class teacher in classrooms. For a traditional teacher this was the natural situation, the justification of which was not subject to doubt. However, gradually the traditional classroom started changing. One of the important changes was the introduction of additional ancillary personnel, such as visitors or teaching assistants. This has brought the classroom closer to real life situations in which conversation is rarely centred on a single pivot (the teacher). Teachers also started breaking up the traditional classroom networks by using pair work and group work, ie, dividing students into smaller groups in which students work with other students rather than with the teacher.

At the same time various activities came to be used outside the classroom. Teachers staffed tuck shops with Japanese mothers (from whom goods could only be purchased in Japanese), took their students to Japanese restaurants where Japanese had to be used to the waitress, organised language camps with the participation of native speakers where, again, Japanese only had to be used. Some of these activities are only suitable for some levels of teaching but visits to Japanese restaurants became a permanent feature of all kinds of courses in the large cities. There are perhaps fewer Japanese waitresses in the 1990s than 20 years ago, but at least the sociocultural benefit of this activity remains unaltered.

Previously, travel to or study in Japan was considered an additional activity, unconnected with courses offered in Australia. Today, we fully realise that this is not an arbitrary addition but an inherent and necessary part of the educational process, at the tertiary, secondary, and perhaps even primary levels. As such it becomes more and more a part of teachers' teaching strategies and is more controlled and structured. It is similar to other out-of-classroom activities, with teachers using the opportunity to expose their students to linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural input (Krashen 1985) in a systematic way. This method supplements the classroom. It does not replace it.

### 3.7 Towards Teaching Acquisition Skills

In the traditional system of language study the teacher was the source of knowledge which was transmitted to the basically passive learner. Today, we see the learner as an active and creative agent who is responsible for much of the acquisition which takes place not only outside the classroom but also within. While the teacher is applying a number of 'teacher strategies' to assist the acquisition process, learners apply 'learner strategies' to achieve the same aim.

A whole area of studies dealing with language learner strategies has recently developed.

Both teacher and learner strategies are gaining acceptance in Japanese teaching in Australia, and the concept of learner strategies is gradually finding its way into teacher training programs in Australia. The concept is of particular importance to the teaching of Japanese because of the need to continue studying the language long after finishing formal studies. Because of the distance between Japanese and English, we should have the opportunity to retain students of Japanese for much longer than our colleagues in other languages. However, this is impossible, and perhaps undesirable. Students start using the language in practical situations while much of it (and much of sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence) is still to be acquired. In this situation instruction in autonomous acquisition skills becomes imperative, more so than in the languages which are closer to English.

Reorientation toward teaching students how to acquire Japanese independently in addition to being taught in classrooms also requires different terminology. We cannot be satisfied with the term 'language teaching'. The aim is not only language and not only teaching. A term such as 'interaction study' will, no doubt, be used much more in the future.

---

### 3.8 Conclusion

We have tried to show that Japanese language study in Australia has undergone substantial qualitative changes in the last two or three decades. Similar changes have affected the teaching of other languages in Australia. What is important in this context is that approaches to Japanese language study have not been isolated from the rest, and in many cases pre-dated similar developments elsewhere. Japanese language study has not only expanded quantitatively - it has also become a modern system as far as its approaches and its aims are concerned.

---

## 4 JAPANESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS

### 4.1 Introduction

In the light of the strong growth in Japanese programs at all levels of education, as documented in Chapter 2, it is not surprising that the supply of Japanese teachers has failed to keep pace. This chapter provides details on the teachers at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels, using data that were extracted from the questionnaires which were described in Section 2.1. As previously mentioned, not all teachers responded to all questions and some teachers completed invalid responses; thus the figures often vary slightly.

### 4.2 Primary Level Teachers

The State distribution of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire and their category of school were provided in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 in Chapter 2 above. In the past those training to become primary teachers were not generally able to include the study of LOTE in their pre-service training and although changes are now occurring, we can expect a further time lag before graduates who have completed a minor or major in Japanese enter schools from institutions specialising in the training of primary school teachers. It is therefore not surprising that the background of teachers currently teaching at the primary level is varied. Many are teachers with secondary training and experience or primary teachers who have recently retrained in Japanese.

A large proportion of primary Japanese teachers who responded to the questionnaire are non-native speakers (87 out of the total of 101 teachers, 86.1%), as shown in Table 4.1.

| Category of speaker | Full-time  | Part-time  | Total      |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Non-native speaker  |            |            |            |
| Female              | 41 (40.6%) | 36 (35.6%) | 77 (76.2%) |
| Male                | 7 (6.9%)   | 3 (3.0%)   | 10 (9.9%)  |
|                     |            |            | 87 (86.1%) |
| Native speaker      |            |            |            |
| Female              | 5 (4.9%)   | 6 (5.9%)   | 11 (10.8%) |
| Male                | 2 (2.0%)   | 1 (1.0%)   | 3 (3.0%)   |
|                     |            |            | 14 (13.8%) |
| All                 | 55 (54.4%) | 46 (45.5%) | 101        |

Table 4.1  
Profile of Japanese primary teachers

We expected to find more native speaker teachers at this level. However, the small number of 14 native speakers does not include assistants / aides or interns, the majority of whom are likely to be native speakers. Female teachers predominate, and overall nearly half of the staff are part-time. Almost two-thirds of teachers are in the 30-49 age range (Table 4.2), a figure which suggests that quite a few teachers have acquired Japanese recently as part of a retraining initiative.



Only 43 of the 87 non-native teachers provided details of the undergraduate study of Japanese which they had completed in the past. Of these, 33 had completed the minimum of a minor study of the language, or a major or Honours major (Table 4.3).

| Age   | No. of teachers | %    |
|-------|-----------------|------|
| 20-24 | 18              | 17.5 |
| 25-29 | 14              | 13.6 |
| 30-39 | 34              | 33.0 |
| 40-49 | 30              | 29.1 |
| 50-   | 7               | 6.8  |
| All   | 103             |      |

Table 4.2  
*Age of Japanese teachers*

| Length of study             | No. of teachers | %    |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Major or equivalent         | 24              | 55.8 |
| Minor or equivalent         | 5               | 11.6 |
| One-year of study           | 6               | 13.9 |
| Honours major or equivalent | 4               | 9.3  |
| Less than one year          | 2               | 4.6  |
| Other tertiary study        | 2               | 4.6  |
| All                         | 43              |      |

Table 4.3  
*Length of Japanese undergraduate study by non-native primary teachers*

Out of 90 teachers, 74 (8%) are currently enrolled in a Japanese course of study. State variation occurs here, with a large number of teachers coming from Queensland. (It must be remembered that 39% of the primary school respondents to our questionnaire came from Queensland.) Furthermore, over half the teachers (44 out of 84, or 52.4%) have also undertaken non-tertiary courses as another means to study Japanese. Quite a few Victorian and Queensland teachers have benefited in this regard. Very occasionally, these alternative forms represent their only study of Japanese. Needless to say, such a practice is unacceptable and should be discouraged in the future. More details on teacher retraining programs are found in Marriott (1992b).

Out of 83 teachers, a quarter (21) claimed to have studied Japanese during the last three years either in Australia or Japan as part of a training/retraining initiative. These teachers came from most States and school systems. A small percentage (14 teachers, or 16.9%) have received study leave over the past three years to further their study of Japanese. There appears to be a difference among the States in the provision of study leave, as six of the 14 teachers come from Victoria. Nearly all the teachers who have retrained belong to the Government systems (11 teachers out of 13, or 84.6%).

As well as language, it is considered desirable if teachers also include in their training a study of aspects of Japanese society and culture. Only just over a quarter of teachers (23 out of 81, or 28.4%) had complemented their language study with a study of Japan-related subjects as part of their tertiary study. Fifteen of these teachers came from Victoria and Queensland. Primary teachers had most commonly studied history (21 teachers, or 91.3%) or literature (14, or 60.9%), followed by linguistics (nine, or 39.1%), anthropology/sociology, economics and politics (each with eight, or 34.8%) or other subjects (three, or 13.0%).



A good proportion of teachers (35 out of 88, or 39.9%) have completed or are completing a postgraduate qualification apart from teaching, most commonly a Graduate Diploma. In half the cases this qualification is Japan-related, with the most common areas of study being linguistics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics or language teaching, followed by a study of Japanese language.

Almost 77% of teachers (66 out of 86) hold an approved qualification to teach at the primary level. The few teachers without approved qualifications are distributed across the States and across the education systems. Teachers possess either a primary school teaching qualification (33 teachers, or 50%), a Bachelor of Arts and Diploma in Education (or equivalent) (30 teachers, or 45.4%) or other qualification (12 teachers, or 18.2%). Of these teachers, just under a half (38 teachers out of 81, or 46.9%) have completed a LOTE teaching method. Furthermore, of these, half (20 teachers out of 40) had undertaken a Japanese teaching method subject. Over half these teachers (12 teachers out of 21, or 57.1%) had completed this Japanese teaching method subject as part of their teacher training qualification while others had taken it in some other form.

In all, these findings suggest that many current primary teachers of Japanese will need on-going support in order to continue their own study of Japanese in a form or forms which are both accessible and suitable for them. There is also a need for more training in general language teaching methodology as well as in Japanese specific language methodology to be available to teachers, both during their initial training and later. This is of special importance to those teachers who are currently retraining in Japanese.

Of the 18 native speakers of Japanese who responded to the survey, some were qualified to teach in Japan at the primary school level. A third (six teachers) had undertaken some training in Japan to teach Japanese as a foreign language, and another third had gained a teacher training qualification in Australia, either as primary school teachers or in the form of BA and Diploma in Education (or equivalent).

It is of considerable importance that institutions which train primary teachers offer methodology courses which provide a rigorous introduction to the teaching of language to young learners, covering the design of courses and materials, teaching techniques and other issues from the perspective of the most up-to-date methodology in LOTE. It was beyond the scope of this project to investigate in depth the kind of programs currently on offer in the teacher training institutions. Nevertheless, some evidence emerged suggesting that certain institutions planning to introduce the language component into their programs wished to do so as cheaply as possible and had not made allowance in their planning for the development of the appropriate methodological components. One institution in Queensland in 1993 introduced a course to train teachers to teach content-based courses in Japanese at the primary level. It will be a pity if a variety of new developments like this is not undertaken. Certainly, the planning of stimulating, innovative programs is needed.

### 4.3 Secondary Level Teachers

The most critical issue in the development and expansion of Japanese in recent years has been the supply of teachers for the secondary level. Our questionnaire deliberately sought detailed information on the background of teachers. The State distribution and school categories of the teachers who responded were given above in Tables 2.11 and 2.12. Over two-thirds of the Japanese teachers are between 30 and 49 years of age, as shown in Table 4.4. The small proportion in the lower age ranges probably indicates the small number of recent graduates of Japanese who have taken up secondary teaching.

| Age   | No. of teachers | %    |
|-------|-----------------|------|
| 20-24 | 57              | 9.5  |
| 25-29 | 93              | 15.5 |
| 30-39 | 226             | 37.5 |
| 40-49 | 180             | 29.9 |
| 50-   | 46              | 7.6  |
| All   | 602             |      |

Table 4.4  
*Age of Japanese teachers at the secondary level*

Japanese at the secondary school level is predominantly taught by non-native speakers of Japanese, with female staff constituting the greater proportion. Table 4.5, based upon information supplied by co-ordinators, shows that of a total of 582 teachers, there are 520 or 89.3% who are non-native speakers and 62 or 10.6% of teachers who are native speakers. Considerable numbers of female teachers are employed part-time<sup>3</sup>.

| Category of speaker | Full-time   | Part-time   | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Non-native speaker  |             |             |             |
| Female              | 297 (51.0%) | 117 (20.1%) | 414 (71.1%) |
| Male                | 87 (14.9%)  | 19 (3.3%)   | 106 (18.2%) |
|                     |             |             | 520 (89.3%) |
| Native speaker      |             |             |             |
| Female              | 26 (4.5%)   | 22 (3.9%)   | 48 (8.4%)   |
| Male                | 10 (1.7%)   | 4 (0.7%)    | 14 (2.4%)   |
|                     |             |             | 62 (10.8%)  |
| All                 | 420 (72%)   | 162 (28.0%) | 582         |

Table 4.5  
*Profiles of Japanese secondary teachers*

In some cases, native speakers teach at schools where there are also non-native speakers. An examination of the proportions of native and non-native teachers across States reveals considerable differences. These data are presented in Table 4.6.

Although South Australia has the largest proportion of native speakers (21.9%) in comparison with non-native teachers, their total number of 32 teachers is not very large. Tasmania has a low proportion of native speakers, and so too does Queensland. In that State, out of 166 respondents to the survey, only five (3.0%) were native speakers. Representatives of the Government systems from

<sup>3</sup> When individual co-ordinators and staff returns are collated, the number of respondents rises slightly to 608, of which 544 are non-native speakers and 64 native speakers. The proportions remain virtually the same, 89.5% and 10.5% respectively. Of the 604 individuals, 473 (78.3%) are female and 131 (21.7%) are male teachers.

Queensland and NSW who spoke at the 1992 National Forum on Japanese Language Teacher Education indicated that preferential treatment is given to the employment of Australians. We wish to argue that, for a variety of reasons, greater participation by native speakers in Japanese courses in Australia is advantageous.

| Govt | No. of native speakers | No. of non-native speakers | All |
|------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----|
| Qld  | 5 (3.0%)               | 161 (96.9%)                | 166 |
| NSW  | 21 (10.7%)             | 175 (89.3%)                | 196 |
| Vic  | 17 (14.9%)             | 97 (85.1%)                 | 114 |
| WA   | 8 (20.0%)              | 32 (80.0%)                 | 40  |
| SA   | 7 (21.9%)              | 25 (78.1%)                 | 32  |
| ACT  | 4 (18.2%)              | 18 (81.8%)                 | 22  |
| Tas  | 1 (3.8%)               | 25 (96.1%)                 | 26  |
| NT   | 1 (20.0%)              | 4 (80.0%)                  | 5   |
| All  | 64 (10.6%)             | 537 (89.3%)                | 601 |

Table 4.6  
Native and non-native speaker teachers of Japanese across States

| State | No. of native speakers | %    |
|-------|------------------------|------|
| Qld   | 5                      | 7.8  |
| NSW   | 21                     | 32.8 |
| Vic   | 17                     | 26.5 |
| WA    | 8                      | 12.5 |
| SA    | 7                      | 10.9 |
| ACT   | 4                      | 6.2  |
| Tas   | 1                      | 1.6  |
| NT    | 1                      | 1.6  |
| All   | 64                     |      |

Table 4.7  
Distribution of native speaker teachers of Japanese across States

The opportunity for learners to have contact with a native speaker teacher thus varies from State to State. Looking at the distribution of teachers who are native speakers (Table 4.7), the largest proportion teach in NSW which has 21 teachers (32.8%), followed by Victoria with 17 (26.5%) teachers. Next comes Western Australia with eight (12.5%), South Australia with seven (10.9%), Queensland five (7.8%), the ACT four (6.2%), and Tasmania and the Northern Territory with one (1.6%) each.

The distribution of native speakers across categories of school also exhibits considerable variation. Table 4.8 presents the total number of teachers in each system, and it also shows the proportion of native and non-native teachers in each system.

| School category | No. of native speakers | No. of non-native speakers | All |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----|
| Govt            | 26 (6.7%)              | 363 (93.1%)                | 389 |
| Govt (Sat.)     | 1 (33.3%)              | 2 (66.7%)                  | 3   |
| Independent     | 19 (14.3%)             | 114 (85.7%)                | 133 |
| Catholic        | 15 (22.0%)             | 53 (78.0%)                 | 68  |
| Other           | 2 (66.7%)              | 1 (33.3%)                  | 3   |
| All             | 63 (10.6%)             | 533 (89%)                  | 596 |

Table 4.8  
Proportion of native and non-native speaker teachers across school categories

The largest of the national categories of schools represented in the survey were Government schools, with 389 or 65.3% of teachers. This was followed by the Independent schools category with 133 schools or 22.3%, and by Catholic schools

with 68 or 11.4% of the schools. The Government schools with Saturday classes only and the category of Other were too small to consider. However, it is the Catholic system which has the highest proportion of native speakers at 22%, followed by the Independent schools with 14%. The proportion in the Government systems is relatively low at 7%. This can be partly explained by the low figure noted above for the State of Queensland. It seems that the recruitment preference given to Australian teachers may be stronger there than in the other States.

One important finding to emerge from our investigation is thus the differences between States and systems in the employment of native speakers of Japanese. Related to this issue is the way in which the overseas qualifications of Japanese teachers are accredited. We noted that different approaches are found in different States and that, furthermore, the regulations and requirements are changing. However, overall, it has often been difficult for native speakers who trained as teachers in Japan to have their qualifications recognised in Australia. It is important that more flexibility be introduced to cope with this matter.

When asked about the difficulty of filling Japanese language teaching positions over the past three years, slightly more than half (146 or 51.2%) denied any problem, in comparison with the 139 (48.8%) co-ordinators who confirmed this difficulty. Nevertheless this finding shows that a large number of schools did experience difficulties, illustrating the teacher shortage which exists. A high percentage of these schools had difficulty in finding either native or non-native speakers. Not shown in these figures is the number of schools which could not commence a program because of an insufficient supply of Japanese teachers. This figure was particularly high in Victoria and may have been so elsewhere too.

Assuming that there are benefits in having teams of native and non-native teachers working together, schools with both native and non-native teachers were asked about the way in which teaching was divided. The two most common patterns are for each teacher to teach his or her own class (46 schools, or 15%) or for native and non-native speakers to regularly teach together in the same classroom (45 schools, or 15%). A third pattern is for the native speakers to regularly withdraw small groups or individuals from the classes of non-native teachers (29 schools, or 10%). A less common practice is for the non-native teachers to teach a class for some lessons and have the native speaker take other lessons (15 schools, or 5%). Native speakers assist with the preparation of written and oral materials (23% each), with correction (20%), and also with other tasks.

Of 526 non-native speakers, over 300 had studied Japanese language in Australia as part of a undergraduate degree. Table 4.9 shows the length of Japanese courses studied at the tertiary level by 317 teachers. Almost 78% have already completed a major (3 years) or Honours major (4 years) and a very small number (11 teachers or 3.5%) has studied less than one year. Of those who had not studied Japanese as part of an Australian undergraduate degree, some may have studied in Japan and a few may have been enrolled at the postgraduate level but completed undergraduate level subjects.

| Length of study             | No. of teachers | %    |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Honours major or equivalent | 22              | 6.9  |
| Major or equivalent         | 161             | 50.8 |
| Minor or equivalent         | 64              | 20.2 |
| One year of study           | 53              | 16.7 |
| Less than one year          | 11              | 3.5  |
| Other tertiary study        | 6               | 1.9  |
| All                         | 317             |      |

Table 4.9  
*Length of Japanese undergraduate study by non-native speakers*

Out of the remaining 226 teachers, many have been retrained in Japanese. They have taken part in one or more of the many initiatives put in place over the past five years to increase the supply of Japanese teachers. For this report we attempted to identify the range of initiatives available in all the States. The findings have already been reported separately (Marriott 1992b), but a list of initiatives has also been provided in Section 2.4.6. An evaluation of these programs would constitute a valuable follow-up topic for research. Results of such an evaluative study would be useful in guiding any future training initiatives, in Japanese or any other language.

The scale of the special training in Japanese has been phenomenal, resulting in a large number of new teachers being made available. However, the spread of Japanese, together with these various training efforts, has unfortunately attracted criticism from others within the language teaching profession. Some of this criticism seems to have weakened recently, perhaps as others accept the fact that our educational system can be more prosperous with a mix of both Asian and European languages. However, the publication of a recent report, *Languages at the Crossroads: the Report of the National Enquiry in the Employment and Supply of Teachers of Languages Other than English* (Nicholas et al. 1993) may provide fuel to those who wish to restrain the spread of Japanese, as is already evident from the media coverage connected with this report.

One part of the Enquiry's report deals with the language proficiency of teachers. This was measured by having teachers 'self-assess their ability to perform a variety of tasks typical of a communicative language classroom'. We do not deny the existence of some teachers of Japanese with low proficiency. However, a perusal of the tasks included in the Enquiry's survey reveals how inappropriate quite a lot were to a Japanese language classroom. These included, for example, the teacher's ability to comprehend a regional dialect or other national variety (other than the standard language), to explain technical concepts, to read works of literature for pleasure or to read to inform self about the history and culture of the country.

Our own report comes up with different findings on the confidence of teachers when tasks more relevant to a school program of Japanese are considered (see below). The fact that the Japanese group in the Nicholas report contained only a very small percentage of native speakers is a further reason for differences in proficiency levels in comparison with teachers of other languages.

If we accept the notion that teachers should also include some area studies in their undergraduate degree, it is somewhat disappointing to find that only 165 of the non-native speakers took Japan-related subjects as part of their tertiary

degree (where the Japan content was defined as half or more of the subject). The majority of these students had studied history (118), followed by literature (82), politics (47), economics (38), anthropology / sociology (33), linguistics (26) or other subjects (16). The low numbers for some of the relevant disciplines such as linguistics and sociology probably occur because traditionally such disciplines have contained little Asian (eg, Japanese) content. On the other hand, most history departments have offered courses which cover parts of Asia, including Japan.

In the *Report of the Inquiry into the Teaching of Asian Studies and Languages in Higher Education* (1989), Ingleson observed that most commonly, area studies subjects should be taught in discipline, rather than in language, departments. This is a contentious issue, a few proponents arguing that language and studies are best offered together. What this survey does show is that the proportion of secondary teachers who have studied non-language area studies as well as language is not very high. There is little difference on a State basis. In NSW, Queensland and Victoria where most Japanese is taught, the proportion of those having studied Japan-related subjects is between 25% and 29%. Although the percentages for the ACT and Tasmania are higher, the overall numbers of teachers involved are low. While some Government Departments of Education have been giving attention to the level of language required by secondary school teachers, we wonder what recommendations have been made to encourage complementary area studies.

Postgraduate qualifications (apart from teaching) are held by a number of non-native teachers. In total, 151 teachers have either completed or are currently completing a postgraduate qualification. This equals about 30% of the total cohort and is therefore not an insignificant figure. Of the 151 teachers, 96 have completed or are currently completing a Graduate Diploma, 29 a Masters degree, and a further 26 some other postgraduate qualification. In most States, the postgraduate qualifications held by just under half the teachers were Japan-related. With regard to the content, an important finding emerges. Of the 96 respondents, 48 (50%) have their postgraduate qualifications in the fields of linguistics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics or language teaching in comparison with only 12 (12.5%) teachers whose area was literature. Another 29 (30.2%) elected to study Japanese language. The high proportion of teachers who have taken courses in linguistics-related areas suggests that for language teachers this is the preferred and most beneficial area. It is perhaps a pity that this combination is not more actively studied - and encouraged - at the undergraduate level.

Study at the postgraduate level enables some teachers to acquire more advanced competence, though at several universities candidates can enrol at this level but undertake undergraduate courses in language. This provision thus enables teachers to gain an award qualification (cf. Section 2.4.6).

A high proportion of non-native Japanese teachers also possesses an approved teaching qualification to teach at the secondary level - 495 (93.6%) out of 529 teachers. Furthermore the majority, 343 (64.8%), possesses a LOTE teaching method. However, this leaves 35.2%, or over a third of teachers who have no LOTE method. Of those who have undertaken a LOTE teaching method, less than half (155, or 45.2%) have studied a Japanese teaching method. Given that



teaching Japanese has different requirements in comparison with the teaching of some European languages, it is disappointing that not all training courses are able to provide specific methodology subjects. On a State-wide basis, Queensland provided 61% of its 109 teachers with a Japanese teaching method, compared with 47% in the case of Victoria and a lower number for NSW. The introduction of Japanese teaching methodology should be a priority where that provision does not currently exist.

Contact with the country of the target language is important to any language teacher. Of 534 non-native teachers, 200 (37.4%) have had the opportunity of studying in Japan. As shown in Table 4.10, teachers had most commonly studied Japanese at an institution other than a university for a mean time of over two and a half months (the maximum being 28 months). The second most common form of study was participation in an exchange program at the secondary level, the mean being just under two months (and a maximum of 12 months). Next, teachers had studied Japanese language at a Japanese university (for an average of over one and a half months and a maximum of 28 months). Others had taken courses other than language.

| Category of study                             | Time (months) mean |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Studied Japanese language at a non-university | 2.68               |
| Exchange at secondary level                   | 1.98               |
| Studied Japanese language at a university     | 1.67               |
| Studied a non-language course                 | 1.33               |

Table 4.10  
Study in Japan by non-native teachers (N=200)

The average time spent studying in Japan is low. Some Australian tertiary institutions in the past have recognised study undertaken in Japan for credit in an Australian degree. Of 186 teachers, only 27 or 14.5% had their study in Japan recognised in such a way. This provision is already improving, with the effect that formal study in Japan is likely to increase. Needless to say, an evaluative study should be undertaken to establish which types of study in Japan, for what lengths of time, and at what levels are most beneficial, as noted above.

A majority of teachers (315 out of 522, or 60.3%) has had the opportunity to visit Japan for purposes other than study, some on more than one occasion. Table 4.11 shows that there is a wide range of purposes for which teachers visit Japan. While holidaying is the most popular reason, over 100 teachers, or nearly a third have accompanied school groups to Japan. Some teachers have also had the opportunity of working in Japan, eg, teaching English, and the Working Holiday Scheme has been utilised by a few teachers in the past. On the other hand, participants in teacher exchange schemes have been few so this is clearly an area for expansion.

| Purpose of visit           | No. of teachers | %    |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Holiday                    | 166             | 52.7 |
| Accompanying school groups | 101             | 32.1 |
| Work: Teaching English     | 58              | 18.4 |
| Working holiday            | 47              | 14.9 |
| Other work                 | 27              | 8.6  |
| Teacher exchange           | 17              | 5.4  |
| JET Program                | 11              | 3.5  |
| Other                      | 57              | 18.1 |

Table 4.11  
Visits to Japan by non-native teachers for non-study purposes (N=315)



Opportunities for communication in Japanese with native speakers provide one important means of language maintenance. For more than half the non-native teachers, such opportunities are limited. Only just over a quarter engage in such communication either daily or twice weekly. This finding is shown in Table 4.12. Since only about 11% of teachers of Japanese in Australia are native speakers, this finding is not surprising.

| Frequency              | No. of teachers | %    |
|------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Daily                  | 56              | 10.8 |
| At least twice weekly  | 86              | 16.6 |
| At least twice monthly | 87              | 16.8 |
| Less than monthly      | 288             | 55.7 |
| All                    | 517             |      |

Table 4.12  
*Opportunities for communication in Japanese with native speakers by non-native teachers*

One of the benefits of increasing the proportion of native speakers in the various education systems will be to provide more opportunities for Japanese language use by non-native teachers. Any program training native speakers as teachers or teaching assistants of Japanese may need to give specific instruction on this matter, as it may not be obvious to native speakers that by using Japanese in this manner they can significantly contribute to the non-native teacher's language maintenance.

We asked teachers to provide us with a self-assessment of their proficiency in Japanese in relation to a set of specific tasks. We considered the existing measures for self-assessment of proficiency too broad and not adequate to cover the specific tasks which need to be undertaken by teachers, either in or outside the classroom. Here teachers were asked to self-assess their ability to use spoken Japanese in the classes they teach. As shown in Table 4.13, nearly two-thirds of the teachers feel that they either have 'sufficient proficiency' or 'sufficient proficiency even though they sometimes might have a few problems'. Given that the number of Japanese teachers has increased so rapidly in such a short time, this is a pleasing result.

| Degree of proficiency                                | No. of teachers | %    |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Sufficient proficiency                               | 149             | 28.3 |
| Sufficient proficiency with a few problems sometimes | 180             | 34.2 |
| Insufficient proficiency                             | 197             | 37.5 |
| All                                                  | 526             |      |

Table 4.13  
*Self-assessment of ability to use spoken Japanese in class*

We also sought to measure the teachers' confidence in managing certain other tasks which either are or could be required of them. The results are shown in Table 4.14. It should be remembered that this is how teachers think about their ability; it is not a measurement of their actual performance.

When the categories of confident and fairly confident are added together, three patterns emerge. Teachers are very confident in writing Japanese materials for use in class and they also possess confidence with other general teaching tasks such as preparing the assessment, preparing work programs, and teaching communicatively. Their confidence in the latter three areas suggest that teachers are receiving adequate training or else have gained sufficient

experience. Teachers have lesser confidence in escorting students to Japan (which many have not done and which, of course, involves many other factors apart from language), skimming authentic materials to select texts to use as teaching materials or producing audio materials for use in class with their own spoken Japanese as a model. (Victorian teachers now need to skim authentic material in order to select teaching materials. This is a difficult task in the case of Japanese but has been imposed upon teachers in an attempt to equalise tasks across languages.) Teachers feel that they have least confidence in speaking in Japanese with a Japanese teaching assistant or with a Japanese visitor at school. Their confidence may be low because these are not regular tasks. However, these are activities which we would like to encourage teachers to engage in more regularly.

| Tasks                                                                                | Confident   | Fairly confident | Not confident |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|
| Speaking in Japanese with a Japanese teaching assistant/aide                         | 91 (17.5%)  | 188 (36.1%)      | 230 (45.2%)   |
| Speaking with a Japanese visitor at school                                           | 78 (15.0%)  | 164 (31.5%)      | 277 (53.2%)   |
| Teaching communicatively                                                             | 176 (33.8%) | 240 (46.1%)      | 94 (18.1%)    |
| Preparing work programs (for syllabuses, where these are set)                        | 240 (46.1%) | 195 (37.5%)      | 79 (15.2%)    |
| Writing Japanese materials for use in class                                          | 215 (41.3%) | 243 (46.7%)      | 62 (11.9%)    |
| Producing audio materials for use in class with their own spoken Japanese as a model | 134 (25.8%) | 191 (36.7%)      | 195 (37.5%)   |
| Skimming authentic materials to select texts to use as teaching materials            | 126 (24.2%) | 208 (40.0%)      | 182 (35.0%)   |
| Preparing the assessment                                                             | 201 (38.6%) | 244 (46.9%)      | 68 (13.1%)    |
| Escorting students to Japan                                                          | 151 (29.0%) | 189 (36.3%)      | 176 (33.8%)   |

Table 4.14

*Confidence of non-native teachers in managing tasks in the teaching of Japanese (N=520)*

An attempt was made to understand the importance of several factors for determining average confidence over the nine tasks displayed in Table 4.14 using correlation analysis (Table 4.15).

| Factors                                                  | Correlation |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Presence of a native speaker at their school             | 0.169       |
| Participation in a recent training/retraining initiative | 0.077       |
| Confidence to teach about Japan                          | 0.411       |
| Study of Japan-related subjects                          | 0.199       |
| Length of time spent in Japan                            | 0.270       |

Table 4.15

*Correlation of non-native speakers' confidence with a range of factors*

The highest correlation was with their confidence to teach about Japan (0.411). The next highest correlations were with length of time spent in Japan and their study of Japan-related subjects. Overall, the impression is that the greater the contact with Japan, the more confident the teacher.

The following table (Table 4.16) shows the teachers' level of confidence with the average time spent in Japan.

Not surprisingly, those teachers who have spent longest in Japan have the highest confidence. However, those teachers who have spent an average of six months there are fairly confident. Teachers lack confidence if they have spent a very short time in Japan.

| Level of confidence | Average years in Japan |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Confident           | 1.5                    |
| Fairly confident    | 0.6                    |
| Not confident       | 0.1                    |

Table 4.16  
*Teachers' level of confidence and time spent in Japan*

We also undertook to correlate the teachers' level of confidence with years of study of Japanese. Table 4.17 shows that those teachers who classify themselves as having insufficient proficiency have studied on average for just over one year. On the other hand, those who feel that they have sufficient proficiency have studied for nearly three years on average.

| Confidence                                 | Mean years of study of Japanese |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Sufficient proficiency                     | 2.913                           |
| Sufficient proficiency with a few problems | 2.200                           |
| Insufficient proficiency                   | 1.330                           |

Table 4.17  
*Correlation of level of confidence with level of qualifications*

As for the Japanese native speakers who responded to the questionnaire, 40 out of 66 (60.6%) are qualified to teach in Japanese middle or senior high schools and of these, over half (22) are qualified to teach English. Nevertheless, half of all native speakers have undertaken some training to teach Japanese as a foreign language. Most commonly, teachers have studied a one-year course (15 native speakers, or 22.7%), a short-term course (one week to three months in duration) (12, or 18.2%), a correspondence course (11, or 16.7%) or other format (seven, or 10.6%). Only one (1.5%) teacher had taken an undergraduate major or minor in the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language in Japan.

Of 63 native speaker teachers, 24 (38.0%) had gained a teacher qualification in Australia, most by obtaining a BA (or equivalent) and a one year postgraduate course (eg, Diploma in Education). Probably all or most of these teachers are permanent residents of Australia. Half of those who obtained a teacher qualification had taken a subject on how to teach Japanese.

Native teachers were asked to self-assess their confidence in six tasks relating to teaching. As seen in Table 4.18, Japanese native teachers are confident or fairly confident with most tasks, managing discipline being the task in which a quarter lack confidence.

A correlation was made between the teachers' confidence and the number of years they had been teaching in Australia. We found that the more years the native speakers have been teaching in Australia, the more confidence they possess. A further correlation was made between their confidence and the presence of non-native teachers at their school (Table 4.19). Highest correlations occur for preparing work programs and participating in teachers' meetings, but there are also positive correlations with preparing the assessment, managing discipline and teaching communicatively. Giving explanations in English in the classroom was the only task which did not yield a positive correlation with the presence of a non-native teacher. This may be because teachers feel confident in this activity, especially since over half the qualified teachers were English teachers in Japan prior to coming to Australia. However, overall, Japanese native

speakers seem to feel more confident if a non-native Japanese teacher is present at the school. It can be claimed therefore that teams of native and non-native speaker teachers are beneficial, not only for the benefits which they bring to students, but also for the support which they can give to each other.

| Task                                            | Confident  | Fairly confident | Not confident | No. of respondents |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Giving explanations in English in the classroom | 29 (44.6%) | 32 (49.2%)       | 4 (6.1%)      | 65                 |
| Teaching communicatively                        | 35 (54.7%) | 27 (42.2%)       | 2 (3.1%)      | 64                 |
| Managing discipline                             | 20 (31.2%) | 28 (43.7%)       | 16 (25.0%)    | 64                 |
| Preparing work programs                         | 35 (55.5%) | 26 (41.3%)       | 2 (3.2%)      | 63                 |
| Preparing the assessment                        | 29 (46.8%) | 30 (48.4%)       | 3 (4.8%)      | 62                 |
| Participating in teachers' meetings             | 16 (25.8%) | 37 (59.8%)       | 9 (14.5%)     | 62                 |

Table 4.18

*Confidence of native speaker teachers of Japanese in managing tasks*

| Tasks                               | Correlations |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Giving explanations in English      | -0.092       |
| Teaching communicatively            | 0.053        |
| Managing discipline                 | 0.148        |
| Preparing work programs             | 0.370        |
| Preparing the assessment            | 0.187        |
| Participating in teachers' meetings | 0.324        |

Table 4.19

*Correlation of native speakers' confidence and presence of non-native teacher*

Concerning the employment status of teachers, whether native or non-native, a majority of 75.8% are full-time teachers and 19.8% are part-time. There are very few teaching assistants or ancillary support staff such as interns. The breakdown is given in Table 4.20.

| Status             | No. | %     |
|--------------------|-----|-------|
| Full-time          | 455 | 75.8  |
| Part-time          | 119 | 219.8 |
| Teaching assistant | 11  | 1.8   |
| Other (eg, intern) | 15  | 2.5   |
| All                | 600 |       |

Table 4.20

*Employment status of Japanese language teachers*

It was surprising to find that there are so few Japanese teaching assistants who participate in Japanese programs. Consequently, there is considerable scope to increase this category. The important issue of teaching assistants is raised again in the section to follow.

A high proportion (82%) of teachers have permanency, with only 16% occupying temporary positions. A number of them hold administrative positions in the school, such as languages' co-ordinator/head. Approximately 16% of teachers teach at more than one school, and 93% of teachers are registered. The language proficiency of over a third (205, or 35%) of teachers was assessed in order for them to gain accreditation as a language teacher. Such assessment occurred in each State. Japanese teachers are able to specialise to a considerable degree, with just under half teaching Japanese only, and another 28% teaching Japanese and one other subject. The number of teachers teaching at various Year levels is shown in Table 4.21.

| Year Level | No. of teachers | %  |
|------------|-----------------|----|
| 7          | 280             | 47 |
| 8          | 423             | 71 |
| 9          | 361             | 60 |
| 10         | 324             | 54 |
| 11         | 240             | 40 |
| 12         | 192             | 32 |

Table 4.21  
*Number of Japanese teachers teaching at each level*

Japanese teachers can be described as active professionally. Seventy per cent are members of a language teachers' association, and in the past twelve months 75% had attended some in-service training which was relevant to Japanese. The reasons for 25% of teachers not attending any in-service training are given in Table 4.22. Problems of timing or the unavailability of suitable training programs accounted for half the respondents' lack of participation. These are matters which could be rectified.

| Reasons for non-participation                                                  | No. of teachers | %  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----|
| No suitable in-service training was available                                  | 53              | 35 |
| Family commitments                                                             | 35              | 23 |
| Unable to obtain leave from school to attend programs held within school hours | 30              | 20 |
| Attending a language course                                                    | 21              | 14 |
| Other                                                                          | 25              | 16 |

Table 4.22  
*Reasons for non-participation by Japanese teachers in in-service training*

Teachers enthusiastically nominated categories of in-service training which they would like. These are set out in Table 4.23. Notably, only 2% indicated their lack of interest in in-service training. There is a great spread here, with Japanese language proficiency upgrading being nominated by 66% of respondents. As this sample covers native as well as non-native teachers, we can assume that the proportion of non-native speakers who nominated this option would be even higher. Materials development came next, followed by training in teaching techniques and methodology.

| Type of training preferred              | No. of teachers | %  |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|----|
| Japanese language proficiency upgrading | 419             | 66 |
| Materials development                   | 397             | 63 |
| Teaching techniques/methodology         | 344             | 54 |
| Japanese language maintenance           | 247             | 39 |
| Teaching new syllabuses                 | 198             | 31 |
| None                                    | 13              | 2  |
| Other                                   | 25              | 4  |

Table 4.23  
*Preferences for in-service training*

This section has covered in detail certain aspects relating to the backgrounds of teachers of Japanese. As stated in various sections throughout this report, the adequate staffing of Japanese courses is a critical issue. While on the one hand, some States should be endeavouring to further support the development of new Japanese programs, support for existing programs and teachers, especially new teachers, is of utmost importance in all States and all school systems.

## 4.4 Higher Education Staff

The questionnaires, described in Section 2.4.1, which were distributed to staff in the higher education sector enabled us to obtain detailed data on the backgrounds of staff. The total number of staff in Japanese language and Japan-related studies (where these are taught in the same unit) is commonly less than ten full-time staff. Only five institutions report more than ten equivalent full-time staff, and only one unit has more than 20 (Table 4.24). While these figures may compare favourably with languages which have small enrolments, in comparison with the large units which exist in faculties/schools for some other subjects, the Japanese units are small.

| Equivalent academic staff figure | No. of institutions |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - 4                            | 5                   |
| 5 - 9                            | 6                   |
| 10 - 14                          | 3                   |
| 15 - 19                          | 1                   |
| 20 - 25                          | 1                   |

Table 4.24

*Number of staff for Japanese language and Japan-related subjects (where the latter are taught in the same unit)*

Most staff are involved in Japanese language teaching only, and some institutions have a small number of staff who teach language and non-language courses. Other institutions have one or two staff teaching non-language courses only. Non-native speakers make up approximately 25% of all staff teaching language, whether full-time, part-time or sessional (Table 4.25). In total, females predominate over males (178 to 77), but even so, a good proportion of native speaker females are either part-time or sessional.

| Category of speaker | Full-time | Part-time | Sessional | Total     |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Non-native speakers |           |           |           |           |
| Female              | 18 (7%)   | 6 (2%)    | 11 (4%)   | 35        |
| Male                | 25 (10%)  | 3 (2%)    | 2 (1%)    | 30        |
|                     |           |           |           | 65 (25%)  |
| Native speaker      |           |           |           |           |
| Female              | 89 (34%)  | 26 (10%)  | 28 (11%)  | 143       |
| Male                | 36 (14%)  | 2 (1%)    | 9 (4%)    | 47        |
| All                 | 166 (65%) | 37 (15%)  | 50 (20%)  | 255 (75%) |

Table 4.25

*Profiles of Japanese language staff*

An examination of the appointment levels of staff shows that a predominance of Japanese staff (162 out of 198, or 81.8%) are at levels A or B (assistant/associate lecturer or lecturer), and that there are only 36 positions above this, ranging from senior lecturer to professor (Table 4.26). By comparison, a higher proportion of staff in the non-language area is in more senior positions. This division between Japanese language and non-language staff is not a distinct one and, in fact, a small number of senior staff while not actually teaching language, are involved in teaching linguistics or applied linguistics and play a leading role in Japanese course design and implementation of the language program.

There is a considerable variation across institutions in the appointment levels of staff. The favourable profile of one of the larger institutions stands out by not employing any level A staff and having, on the other hand, five senior lecturers,



nine lecturers and one professor. Another large department has, in total, three staff at the levels of D and E none at level C, 14 at B and six at level A. At the other extreme are those departments where no staff member teaching Japanese is above the lecturer level. At best, in some institutions the highest position of the person responsible for Japanese is a single senior lecturer. It came to our attention that some Japanese language programs are being run by staff who do not possess specialised competence in the teaching of Japanese. We strongly recommend that more attention be given to the appointment of staff who are full professionals in the area.

| Appointment level                                         | No. of staff |              |           |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
|                                                           | Language     | Non-language | Either*   | Total      |
| Level A (assistant lecturer, senior tutor, tutor)         | 61 (30.8%)   | 3 (1.5%)     | 9 (4.5%)  | 73 (36.8%) |
| Level B (lecturer)                                        | 74 (37.4%)   | 10 (5.1%)    | 5 (2.5%)  | 89 (45.0%) |
| Level C (senior lecturer)                                 | 14 (7.1%)    | 7 (3.5%)     | 2 (1.0%)  | 23 (11.6%) |
| Level D (associate professor, reader, principal lecturer) | 4 (2.0%)     | 5 (2.5%)     |           | 9 (4.5%)   |
| Level E (Professor)                                       | 1 (0.5%)     | 3 (1.5%)     |           | 4 (2.0%)   |
| All                                                       | 154 (77.8%)  | 28 (14.1%)   | 16 (8.1%) | 198        |

Table 4.26  
Appointment levels of Japanese language and non-language staff  
\* One institution responded in this manner

The relatively low levels of Japanese staff are partly attributable to the recent but rapid development of this subject area, resulting in a shortage of staff. One university reports that it is impossible to find non-native language teachers with MA or PhD qualifications or to find staff in Japanese studies at levels A or B. Given the size of our present postgraduate courses, discussed above, the current shortage is not likely to be rectified soon. Serious action is thus needed. Difficulties exist in recruiting senior staff from Japan and elsewhere overseas, even though some successful appointments have been made in the past. Many programs have insufficient budgets to employ senior level staff with the appropriate qualifications and experience, even when such individuals become available.

The proportion of sessional staff in any language course is also an important concern. As shown in Table 4.27, 17 institutions use sessionals to staff 25% or less of their teaching hours. It is worrying, however, to note that four institutions use sessionals for between 25% and 50% of their teaching hour requirements, and worse still, two use over 50% of casual staff. Such a proportion facilitates staffing the program in the cheapest possible manner, but when quality of teaching and program design is considered, together with the need to provide young staff with maximum training opportunities, this policy must be strongly questioned. On the other hand, the engagement of sessionals can provide promising postgraduate students with excellent experience and, if combined with active guidance from skilled staff, the individual as well as the system can expect to benefit. We have already seen, however, that departments with a strong postgraduate group are few, and therefore this opportunity cannot be utilised as often as it should.



| Proportion of teaching sessional staff | No. of institutions | %    |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|------|
| Less than 10%                          | 7                   | 30.4 |
| 10 - 25%                               | 10                  | 43.5 |
| 25 - 50%                               | 4                   | 17.4 |
| Over 50%                               | 2                   | 8.7  |
| All                                    | 23                  |      |

Table 4.27  
Proportion of sessional staffing

Difficulties in staff recruitment are reported to exist at the tertiary as well as at the primary and secondary levels. Fifteen out of 22 institutions indicated some difficulty over the past three years in employing staff to teach Japanese language. It appears that the greatest difficulties lie in the employment of native speakers, particularly senior staff (Table 4.28). This phenomenon may occur because institutions do not possess adequate networks in Japan. Cases have been reported where not a single application was received in response to advertisements for level C (senior lecturer) positions in either Japanese language or studies. One member of staff recently appointed at level C claims to have received five offers spread across two countries. Senior staff members are in very short supply.

| Level of staff          | No. of institutions |                     |     |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----|
|                         | Native speakers     | Non-native speakers | All |
| Lower level (A)         | 6 (66.7%)           | 3 (33.3%)           | 9   |
| Middle level (B)        | 9 (90.0%)           | 1 (10.0%)           | 10  |
| Upper levels (C, D & E) | 6 (100.0%)          |                     | 6   |

Table 4.28  
Difficulties in staff recruitment

As for methods of recruitment of native teachers of Japanese language, most institutions used multiple methods (Table 4.29). By far the most common response was to advertise in an Australian newspaper, which is generally obligatory. Use of personal contacts in Australia was the method pursued next, followed by use of personal contacts in Japan. Advertisements are sometimes lodged elsewhere overseas, but usually only for Level D and C staff. A few institutions advertise in Japan.

| Method of recruitment             | No. of universities | %    |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------|
| Advertise in Australian newspaper | 21                  | 91.3 |
| Advertise in Japan                | 6                   | 26.1 |
| Advertise elsewhere overseas      | 7                   | 30.4 |
| Use personal contacts in Japan    | 12                  | 52.2 |
| Use personal contact in Australia | 17                  | 73.9 |
| Other                             | 1                   | 4.3  |

Table 4.29  
Methods of recruitment of native speaker staff for Japanese language (N=23)

Other data on the backgrounds of language staff were collated for this project but will not be commented upon. These data have been included in Appendix 6. It includes information on age, study of Japan-related subjects and undergraduate majors, postgraduate studies, study in Japan, reasons for visits to Japan, total time spent in Japan, academic qualifications, completion of courses on teaching Japanese, employment status, terms of appointment and levels of position. Tables are also included on the hours taught by sessional and regular staff, level of position cross-tabulated with postgraduate qualifications, supervision of

Honours and postgraduate students, research activities and interest in in-service training.

Despite the very positive expansion which has occurred in the teaching of Japanese in higher education in recent years, as described in Chapter 2, we have argued in this report that more attention needs to be given to this sector. In particular, its growth requires better planning and adequate financial resources. These are matters which require urgent solutions.

## 4.5 TAFE Staff

Since TAFE institutions offer non-award courses as frequently as they offer certificate/award courses, it was not surprising to find eight out of 14 institutions reported that sessional staff carry out more than 50% of the Japanese language teaching. At a further four institutions, sessionals conduct between 25% and 50% of the teaching.

Of the 17 language staff (including co-ordinators) who provided details on their backgrounds, 12 were non-native speakers of Japanese and five were native speakers; 12 were female. The majority fell into the 40-49 year old age group, and the fewest in the 25-29 age group category. Respondents, who were teaching either certificate/award or non-award courses, covered every State but not the Northern Territory.

We sought details on the academic and teacher training background of these teachers. Nine non-native speakers of Japanese indicated that they had studied Japanese language in Australia as part of a tertiary undergraduate degree. Of these, five had completed a three year major in Japanese and one an Honours major. Three claimed to have completed some other form of study. In their undergraduate courses, six had also studied some Japan-related courses and three had not. Teaching qualifications were possessed by seven of the sample, five of these having completed a BA and Diploma in Education. Six had completed a LOTE teaching method, but of these only two had been able to study a Japanese teaching method.

The length of time these teachers had spent in Japan for study and non-study purposes varied. Three had spent between two and nine months in Japan, while the time ranged from one year to eight years for another four teachers. Seven of the teachers had studied some Japanese in Japan. The data thus show that half the non-native teachers have not visited Japan. This is an unacceptable proportion.

Of the five native speaker teachers who completed the questionnaire, four were qualified to teach in Japan at middle or senior high school. Of these, only two had taken some training in Japan to teach Japanese as a foreign language.

None of the native or non-native teachers in the survey possessed a Masters degree. However, one teacher indicated 'other', which may have been a rare case of a PhD. This compares with our sample from the higher education level where 38% of Japanese language teachers have completed an MA and 10% a PhD

(see Appendix 6). From our data, we can conclude that TAFE teachers, in general, possess similar qualifications to those held by secondary school teachers.

## 4.6 Notes on Teacher Education

Preliminary data on teacher education were gathered for this report but it was not possible to conduct a full-scale survey of courses throughout the country within the scope of the project. Our information indicates that many institutions have been slow to adapt to the particular needs of Japanese teachers. For example, many student teachers of Japanese still do not have adequate language-specific methodology programs available to them. On the other hand, there has been a small number of extremely innovative programs introduced in recent years. These include a training program for native speakers at the University of Technology in Sydney, an intensive in-service training course fully funded by the Queensland Government at Griffith University and a bilingual program for primary teachers at the University of Central Queensland, Rockhampton (see Chapter 2).

While we are unable to make detailed comments on teacher education, we wish to provide some notes on the type of training which is necessary to provide competent teachers of Japanese. We have identified five important areas (Roper 1992):

1. Competence in actual interaction in Japanese;
2. Explicit knowledge of Japanese linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural rules and strategies;
3. Methodology of teaching Japanese;
4. General teaching methodology and theory; and,
5. Teaching practice.

In our experience it is only the last two of these areas which are adequately covered in the majority of existing programs.

It is the first point, the need for competence in Japanese, which has aroused most debate in recent years. Very often this has taken the form of a demand for competence **before** entry to teacher training programs, rather than a recognition of the desirability of providing further language training during teacher training. Specific manifestations have been the introduction of stringent proficiency tests both as an entry requirement for teacher training courses and as a condition of certification. The discussion of this issue has also been characterised by somewhat unrealistic expectations on the part of teacher training and certification authorities, few of whom are experts in Japanese. In this regard it is necessary to realise that the role of the language teacher is changing. The teacher is still one of the providers of models of correct speech, but new language teaching methodologies require that he or she is not the only provider. There is a need to introduce into the classroom a number of other Japanese speakers such as Japanese exchange students, visitors, visiting teachers, teaching assistants, and so on. There is evidence that this is already occurring in many areas (eg, the large number of schools which have established sister school agreements with schools in Japan, cited in Chapter 2). The use of technology such as videos also

enables the provision of a wider range of models and interaction experiences for students. Thus with the adoption of contemporary teaching methods the teacher becomes more the director of studies rather than the only speaker of Japanese the students ever meet.

The language competence of Australian teachers of Japanese is an important issue but should not be over-emphasised. Instead, planning authorities should make sure that a sufficient number of teaching assistants (Neustupný 1992) is available for use in Australian schools, that all schools receive exchange students from Japan and that as many native speakers as possible participate in the teaching process. Moves such as those seen in Victoria, where from 1996 four years of the study of Japanese (or three years after the VCE), instead of the current two, will be required, are unnecessary and unrealistic in the light of our findings about the lack of interest in teaching on the part of graduates (see Chapter 6). A much more useful strategy would be to require teacher trainees to undertake further language study, tailored to their needs as teachers, as part of their teacher training. One obstacle in the way of providing such training is the lack of professional expertise in this area in faculties of education. In most cases such programs would best be implemented through co-operation with language departments, which possess the expertise to produce courses at this level. Ideally the courses would be specifically tailored to the needs of teachers, and the same program might be able to be utilised for teacher up-grading and refresher courses as well as for pre-service teachers. Although they would be an additional requirement, such courses would no doubt be welcomed by the students, who often complain that they actually forget their Japanese while participating in teacher training courses. Such training already occurs in undergraduate education courses, and has started to appear on a limited scale in postgraduate programs. We strongly recommend that it be made mandatory.

Such training should not be narrowly linguistically based. Due to the adoption of the most recent teaching methodology, it is essential that teachers acquire not only language but also Japanese sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence. This is a point that has traditionally been absent from the education of language teachers.

The second kind of competence listed above, explicit knowledge of the interaction system, is also of high importance. Without possessing such knowledge, teachers cannot explain, plan exercises and other activities, or design courses. Instead, they become fully dependent on the textbook. Unfortunately, many Australian departments of Japanese at the tertiary level (not unlike many other language departments) do not teach explicit grammar in a systematic way; nor are language students normally required to take subjects about Japan. Explicit knowledge cannot therefore be assumed to have been acquired at the undergraduate level and should be covered in teacher training courses.

Thirdly, instruction in Japanese teaching methods, not just general LOTE teaching methods, should be offered, but this is not easy. There is still a shortage of staff qualified in this field and a shortage of teaching materials. However this area is one which we cannot afford to neglect any longer. While low linguistic competence has repeatedly been the target of concern by administrators and commentators, the lack of appropriate methodological competence and awareness has received scant attention. We would like to argue

that this area is, if anything, more crucial for effective language teaching than is linguistic competence.

It is essential that in all the three areas mentioned above the faculties of education liaise with Japanese departments of their universities or of other institutions. At present, very few have Japanese language experts on staff, and there has been an unfortunate tendency to resort to the employment of under-qualified sessional staff when Japanese-specific methodology courses or language courses have been introduced. The relationships between language departments and their counterparts in education faculties have sometimes been characterised by insularity and mutual distrust, but this situation should not continue. The sharing of available expertise is essential if the quality of teacher training in areas specific to Japanese is to be improved.

---

## 5 SECONDARY STUDENT MOTIVATION TO CONTINUE OR DISCONTINUE JAPANESE

### 5.1 The Issue: Motivation

This chapter deals with one particular issue of Japanese language study in Australia: the motivation of learners at the secondary level.

The term *motivation* refers to objectives which participants in the acquisition process put before themselves. Motivation can be positive - if it leads to acquisition, or negative - if its aims are to avoid or discontinue the acquisition process. In this chapter we will deal with both these issues, motivation for continuation and discontinuation. If motivation is known, it can be exploited by language managers to regulate the acquisition process.

The most widely known theory of motivation is that of Gardner and Lambert (1972). In their theory motivation has been classified as either instrumental or integrative. Whereas instrumental motivation puts up objectives which result in gains in work or study situations, integrative motivation aims at identification with the target language group. Although this distinction is important, it deals with only one limited aspect of the processes involved. For example, the aims of the participants may be communicative or symbolic - to express the learner's positive attitude to the new arrangement of the world in the 1990s; the aim of language study may also be to engage in a pleasurable activity - as when the learner 'likes languages'. Neither of these cases can easily be included within the Gardiner-Lambert framework. We consider it therefore more appropriate to adopt a wider scheme, such as presented by Neustupný (1992a):

1. Interactive motives. The aim of language study is to improve interaction with native speakers of Japanese. This can be either for instrumental or integrative reasons.
2. Understanding-of-culture motives. The aims are to understand the phenomenon of language, communication and society/culture. Again, instrumental or integrative orientation can be present.
3. Skill-formation motives. These motives are concerned with the acquisition of cognitive skills in general. Language learners are expected to develop the ability to accumulate and actually use an extensive system of interrelated knowledge. This kind of motivation is rarely present in learners. It is typical for teachers and some parents and will therefore be of little relevance to this chapter.
4. Symbolic motives. Japanese language teaching in Australia may serve as a symbol of progressiveness. This kind of motivation is primarily symptomatic of educational administrators, teachers, parents and adult learners, but can perhaps be transferred to some learners at the secondary level. Language can also be a symbol of belonging to an ethnic group. For secondary learners of languages such as Italian this motivation (positive

or negative) may be important but it would seem that it is not very common in the case of Japanese.

5. Affective motives. The aims of the learners may be to engage in an activity that brings them personal enjoyment or satisfaction. This is potentially an important group of motives. To study Japanese because we like the teacher or because our friends take the subject can also be classified under this heading. Negative motivation of this kind can be based on lack of success in the language or lack of rapport with the teacher.
6. Social motives. These motives have to do with the learners' social needs, such as to complete a course, to satisfy superiors (parents and teachers).

The study of motivation is not easy. Motives are often unconscious and are not easily accessible to the researcher. They are reflected in the perception of the learners, but this perception is already influenced by their social environment and cannot be automatically taken for motives as such. For example, students may believe that they study Japanese for interaction but their real motives may be purely social (to satisfy demands for their degree, or similar). Moreover, when verbalised, such perceptions are further subject to speech constraints: speakers sometimes decide not to verbalise their perceptions or verbalise them in a way which is generally accepted in the society in question. For example, to say that Japanese is an economically important language is a common pattern in Australia and we can expect that this pattern will appear in the way in which learners speak about their motives for undertaking Japanese, often irrespective of their real perceptions or real motives.

Overall, we can then posit at least three distinct stages in the reporting of motives:

1. Motives as such,
2. Perceived motives, and
3. Reported motives.

Since the strongest influence on learners' behaviour can be assumed to derive from motives as such, we must attempt their fullest possible listing. A satisfactory methodology implies extensive interviews in which the students' consciousness of motives, ways of speaking and actual behaviour, including affective behaviour, are established. Since this approach could not be adopted in this study because of various constraints, we shall try to extrapolate conclusions concerning motives of secondary learners of Japanese from their answers to a questionnaire.

## 5.2 The Data

### 5.2.1 The source of the data

The data used in this chapter are based on a questionnaire returned by 2,141 Year 11 students of 69 Australian secondary schools who studied a language other than English when they were in Year 10. This group of 2,141 students will be referred



to as the 'sample'. It should be noted when comparisons are made between the overall sample and the Japanese group that the overall sample includes the students of Japanese. The schools were selected by co-ordinators of the Nine Key Languages Project of the NLLIA in order to include students who had been or still were taking any of the following languages: Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Italian, Indonesian, Greek, Spanish or Arabic. Only 1,028 students, that is, 48% of the sample, were still studying a language at the time of the survey. The decision to include students who had discontinued their language studies was taken by the group which developed the survey in order to obtain data not only for positive but also for negative motivation.

No attempt was made at systematic sampling and the results are not, therefore, statistically representative for any part of the secondary school population. It is our belief that the sample nevertheless reveals some basic issues that can be verified in further studies.

---

### 5.2.2 Number of respondents

Although the aim of the NLLIA was to include approximately the same number of students for each of the nine languages, French learners represented over 30% of all respondents, while Spanish accounted for only 2.1%. Japanese was fourth, with 270 learners at Year 10 thus representing 12.6% of the sample. This part of the sample will be referred to as the 'Japanese group'. The Japanese group derived from 27 schools out of the total of 69 schools for the whole sample. However, only seven schools provided ten or more respondents. It is fair to assume that the schools selected by project co-ordinators for individual languages were well known to them because they represented the 'better schools' for each language, normally with a longer tradition of teaching the language. The over-representation of French in the sample was probably due to the fact that many of the schools nominated by other language co-ordinators also taught French, which is the 'establishment' foreign language in Australia.

---

### 5.2.3 States

As far as the representation of States in the sample is concerned, 38% of the respondents were from NSW, 30% from Victoria, 18% from Queensland, 10% from Western Australia and 2.8% from South Australia. However, in the case of the Japanese group, 45% of respondents were from Queensland, almost 40% from Victoria and only 14.4% from NSW. Less than 1% of students came from Western Australia and South Australia. This distribution arose for pragmatic reasons (the ease of distributing the questionnaires) and does not reflect in any way the quantity or quality of the teaching of Japanese in the States which are not represented or which, like NSW, are under-represented.

---

#### 5.2.4 Government, Independent and Catholic schools

In the sample students from Government schools accounted for 49%, with Independent schools at 37% and Catholic schools at 13%. However, in the Japanese group Independent schools provided 42%, Government schools 39% and Catholic schools 19% of the 270 respondents. This distribution reflects the fact that in many States Japanese is better established in Independent than in Government schools. However, it also reveals a strong over-representation of Independent schools and to some extent Catholic schools, and an under-representation of Government schools, when compared with the distribution found in our survey of secondary schools (cf. Table 2.12).

#### 5.2.5 Sex of respondents

With regard to sex, the sample and the Japanese group coincided with approximately 53% male and 47% female students. This relationship is intriguing, because it is generally believed that girls constitute the majority of language learners in Australia. We should bear in mind that these figures include both those who are still studying languages and those who discontinued after Year 10 and it would be of interest to know whether the ratio is the same for students who discontinued and who were still studying Japanese in 1992.

#### 5.2.6 Ethnic origin

Seventy-four per cent of the sample as well as of the Japanese group were born in Australia. However, since 49.8% of the total sample (30.2% of the Japanese group) reported speaking a language other than English at home, we can conclude that their ethnic origin was clearly biased towards first or later generation non-English speaking immigrants. This is not surprising, given that a number of community languages was included in the project. Since Japanese is not a community language, the percentage of students with ethnic background is lower in the Japanese group.

Only three students in the whole sample were born in Japan but it is not clear from the data whether they all spoke Japanese at home or not. However, they were included in the Japanese group.

Of the Japanese group, 10.4% of students migrated to Australia from Chinese speaking regions (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia). Since the average for students from these countries in the sample is 6.3% we can conclude that students of Chinese ancestry enrol for Japanese more often than for the other languages together and that they constitute a significant, though not a major, section of learners of Japanese at this level. However, this trend is not as strong as in the case of tertiary institutions where learners of Chinese ancestry sometimes constitute a much larger sector of Japanese classes.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that almost 6% of students in the Japanese group (compared with 9% in the sample) were born in countries of European ancestry. At least 7.4% of the Japanese group speak a European LOTE at home: this means that in addition to those of European ancestry, there is also a number of learners who are second generation Australians and maintain their ethnic language while learning Japanese. The study of Japanese can therefore be characterised as being supported by students of both Chinese and European origin.

---

### 5.2.7 Socio-economic background

With regard to their socio-economic background, certain inferences can be made from the educational level of the students' parents. Although in the sample, 41% of students reported that their fathers possess an undergraduate or higher degree, in the Japanese group this rises to 50%. For mothers, the figures were 32.5% for the sample and 34.8% for the Japanese group. Eighty per cent of students in the sample and 85% in the Japanese group intend to attend a tertiary education institution while only 7% and 6% respectively intend to attend a TAFE. These figures seem to indicate that languages are studied in Australia by middle or upper middle class students, and that this is particularly true of Japanese. However, the bias in the sample towards Independent schools (particularly for the Japanese group) means that the figures must be treated with caution.

A further detailed study will be needed because the question in our survey was not formulated clearly enough and respondents seemed to have problems in answering it. For example, for fathers, over 6% of the Japanese group did not answer the question at all and 26% reported a postgraduate degree. This seems quite unrealistic and leads us to the assumption that students at this stage do not understand such terms as 'undergraduate' or 'postgraduate' degree. We also must take into consideration that between 25% and 30% of the Japanese group had parents who were born and educated overseas and even if they possessed the relevant information, they were faced with the necessity to compare the overseas systems with the scale formulated on the basis of the Australian educational system.

---

### 5.2.8 Selection of subjects in Year 11

The subjects which students in the Japanese group selected can be classified into four groups.

In group one are mathematics (Japanese group 61.3%, sample 58.4%), chemistry (Japanese group 50.6%, sample 41.8%) and physics (Japanese group 41.6%, sample 37.7%).

The second group comprises biology (Japanese group 34.6%, sample 30.2%) and economics (both groups 30.1%).

The third group has subjects in which 10-25% of students enrol: Australian studies, maths 2, geography, history, religion, accounting, art and psychology. Various languages other than Japanese can also be classified here: total enrolment of Japanese group students in language subjects is 13.4%.

The fourth group are subjects which enrol less than 10% of the students.

It is significant that students in the Japanese group are better represented than the sample as a whole in enrolments in the prestige subjects in group 1. This can be interpreted as a testimony that the Japanese group students are very 'good students'. It should also be noted that the students also enrol for a large number of subjects which are not vocationally oriented.

### 5.2.9 Profile of the Japanese student

The information provided in the preceding sections can be summarised as follows: a typical student in our sample who took Japanese in Year 10 (and either continued or discontinued the language in Year 11) was slightly more often a male than a female, was born in Australia in approximately 75% of cases but in 30% of cases spoke a language other than English at home, was of middle class origin, and a good student. A large percentage of these students plan to study at the tertiary level. Students in the overall sample were even more likely to speak a LOTE at home, they were also strongly middle class (even if somewhat less so than the Japanese students), academically successful (even if not reaching the same level as students in the Japanese group) and planned to proceed to tertiary studies (even if less often than the students of Japanese).

The number of ethnic Japanese students was extremely limited.

The selection of subjects of the Japanese group students showed the same bias towards mathematics, physics and chemistry as the overall sample, but was not particularly slanted in any other way. There were subjects taken for enjoyment as well as those which fitted into particular vocational plans.

## 5.3 Positive Motivation of the Students

The following analysis will be based on the Japanese group but comparison will be made with the sample. It is only in such comparisons that the meaning of the Japanese data can be understood.

In response to the questionnaire some learners of Japanese said they took Japanese as their first foreign language while others studied Japanese as their second foreign language. There were 244 students in the former and 26 students in the latter group. For the purpose of the following analysis the difference has been disregarded and figures for Japanese as LOTE 1 and LOTE 2 have been combined.

### 5.3.1 Interactive motivation

In this section we shall discuss evidence which shows that the subjects of this study aim at achieving competence to interact with the Japanese.

In Question 11 of the questionnaire the subjects were asked to report what factors contributed to their decision to continue the study of Japanese. One of the factors was 'I have definite plans to work in an area of employment where the language is used'. The respondents rated the importance of their choice on a scale of five. In the following discussion we shall group the last two points of the scale as 'important' and the first two points as 'not important', to obtain two contrasting figures.

In the Japanese group 51.7% of learners said that definite plans for work were an important factor for them, while 29.8% said that this was not important. This contrasts with 30.9% and 43.6% in the sample.

Several comments should be made concerning these results before we jump to the conclusion that the Japanese students are very highly economically motivated. Firstly, Japanese is indeed a language that can be used for employment. Although Year 12 Japanese alone does not prepare students for using the language at work, tertiary studies do, and there has been an annual shortage of university graduates in Japanese over the last few years. The same circumstances do not apply to the same extent in the case of the other eight languages. Because of these circumstances we must, of course, expect that the economic factor will be present to a much larger extent in the Japanese group than in the overall sample.

However, is this the whole story? A second important circumstance is that Japanese has been discussed as an economic language in the community for a number of years. It would therefore be unusual if this did not influence the way in which students report their intentions. In other words, it is possible that even students who do not have a burning desire to work in the area of Australian-Japanese relations in fact report that they would like to do so. This may be not only a feature of their style of reporting but also a feature of the perception of their motives.

Responses to the request to rate another statement about their decision to continue with Japanese may be closer to the respondents' actual motives. The statement is 'I do not have definite plans for the future but I feel that the language would enhance my future career prospects'. Here 73% of the Japanese group thought that this supported their decision to continue, while only 11.3% thought that it did not. The gap between the Japanese group and the all-languages sample narrows, with the sample agreeing in 64% and disagreeing in 16% of cases. Note that 73% of the Japanese students agreed that they had 'no definite plans', while in the above question 51.7% reported that they 'had definite plans'. This implies that a certain proportion of students selected both categories, and thus contradicted themselves. Perhaps this was because respondents reacted more strongly to the second part of the question ('I feel that the language would enhance my future career prospects') than to the first part ('I do not have definite plans').

Also notice that in the former question only 51.7% of students replied positively and that almost 30% replied negatively. In other words, there is a large proportion of Japanese students who are sure that they are not taking Japanese because of 'definite plans' for their future work. On the other hand, the moderate statement appealed to 73% of the respondents.

Another question to which a response was required in Question 11 was on whether the decision of the student to continue with the language was influenced by 'contact with the country where the language is spoken (past travel, friends, parent's work, etc)'. It can be assumed that where such contact exists or existed, it would contribute to the motivation of the students to improve their capacity to interact. Of the Japanese group 39.1%, and 44.6% of the whole sample, reported that this was an important factor. The contact is stronger in the case of the whole sample, but this is not surprising because almost 50% of the sample are students with non-English ethnic backgrounds. Since only 3 students in the Japanese group (1.1%) were of Japanese origin, the fact that almost 40% reported existing contact with Japan appears to be highly significant in general and for the consideration of their motivation to study Japanese.

It seems that students in the Japanese group also attribute considerable importance in their decision to study the language to the presence of the Japanese in Australia. In Question 11, 26.9% of them reported that they continued the study of Japanese because of 'contact with the ethnic community in Australia which speaks' the language. Here, the reference is likely to be made in relation to their Japanese teachers.

As far as the prospects of travel or living in Japan are concerned, there is hardly any difference between the Japanese group and the whole sample. Of the Japanese group 26.7%, and 25.1% of the sample, reported that they continue the study of the language involved because they 'want to travel or live in the country' (Question 11).

We are not trying to say that the study of Japanese has no economic value or that this value does not motivate the students. What we wish to suggest is that such motivation is probably weaker than is commonly stated to be the case. On the other hand there is interactive motivation which derives from contacts with Japan (either the students' or their families') and contacts with the Japanese in Australia.

The motivation of the Japanese group should also be considered in relation to other subjects which they select. Practically the same percentage of students in the Japanese group and in the sample enrolled for economics (about 30%) and accounting (about 13%), fewer in legal studies, business communication and practical computers, and more of the Japanese students enrolled for music and subjects such as theatre and arts or speech and drama. It would be difficult to maintain that the Japanese group is one-sidedly oriented towards preparing for jobs in business.



### 5.3.2 Understanding of culture as a motive

The only source of data from which we can judge the presence of this type of motivation is one sub-question in Question 11. Respondents were asked whether the fact that they 'liked studying about the culture and society' of the country where the language is spoken influenced their continuation of the study of the language. Of the Japanese group 53.4% - against 47.2% for the whole sample - agreed that this influence was there. This is a high percentage. The difference between the Japanese group and the sample as a whole is not very large, but it does suggest that the Japanese students may be somewhat more highly motivated in this respect than students of other languages. This is not surprising if we consider the fact that Japanese culture and society are perceived as very different (hence interesting) as well as modern (hence applicable). As mentioned in Chapter 3, there is a distinct trend in the teaching of Japanese to include sociocultural competence in the curriculum.

---

### 5.3.3 Symbolic motivation

The only data relevant for this issue are available in answers to another sub-question in Question 11. Students were asked to state to what extent 'ethnic origin and/or religion' were important for their decision to continue the study of the language in Year 11. Of those who answered the question, three respondents gave the statement rating four on the five point scale. Those students who considered the factor important (though not 'very important') may have been the three students of Japanese parentage in our sample. We would expect that other students would select rating 1 ('not important'). However, this was done by only 73.7 of the respondents, while 12 respondents (10.2%) gave the factor rating 2 and 16 respondents (13.6%) rating 3. Why? Were there more students with Japanese parents in the Japanese group, or did some other Asian students wish to say that they were studying Japanese because it is an Asian language? No doubt some learners could be of mixed origin but it is unlikely that this would constitute almost 24% of the group. Perhaps the question was simply misunderstood.

In the overall sample, as could be expected, 29.4% of respondents considered the factor important. However, since foreign languages were also involved, 55.9% of students rated the factor 1 or 2 on the scale.

The importance of the factor for the student's decision to continue does not directly translate into the language being a symbol of ethnic identity. Purely instrumental reasons may be involved, but the presence of a symbolic role is also a possibility.

---

### 5.3.4 Affective motivation

An important affective motive for language study is 'liking languages'. The majority of students in the Japanese group who continued the study of Japanese into their eleventh year agreed that this was an important factor in their



decision (54.8%), while only 9.5% gave it the rating 1 ('not important'). In the whole sample the percentage of those who held the factor as important was even higher (58.5%) and as we shall see this agrees with the overall tendency for the Japanese group to be somewhat less affective in their motivation.

Liking the teacher represents another affective motive which was tested in the questionnaire. We asked whether 'particularly liking the teacher' was an important factor in the student's decision to continue. Only 13.8% of the Japanese group and 22.4% of the whole sample said that it was important.

The element of empathy with other students is included in the factor 'one or more of my friends were taking the subject' which only 7.8% of the Japanese group, as against 12.8% of the whole sample, rated as important. In all cases students of other languages appear to be more easily guided by affective motives.

### 5.3.5 Social motivation

The previous factor could also be classified as a social one. Similar factors include accepting the advice of the family and the advice of teachers. The family is rated as important by 31.3% of the Japanese group and by exactly the same percentage by other students in the sample. The teachers' advice was important for 20.9% of the Japanese group and 24.2% of the whole sample.

Students are assessed in their subjects and this is of particular importance in the last two years of the secondary school. Therefore, it is not surprising if they are motivated by the aim to achieve good marks. The fact that they had good marks in the past indicates to them that they may achieve good results again in the future. We asked whether the fact that they 'had good marks in the past' influenced their decision to continue studying the language. Of the Japanese group 40.5% said that this was important whereas in the case of the whole sample the percentage was much higher (54%).

Some subjects must be selected by students and Japanese may be selected because there was no other subject, just to satisfy the requirements of the school or for an examination. The students were asked whether it was true that 'although I had no strong desire to continue, other subjects were even less attractive'. Very few students agreed that this was an important factor for them: 13% for the Japanese group and 14.1% for the whole sample. The respondents obviously did not want to admit that some of the subjects they were taking were not attractive.

The Japanese group appears to be quite strongly affected by family advice and good marks. Teacher's advice and the unavailability of better subjects are much less important. It is noticeable, as in the case of affective motives, that the values for the whole sample are close to those for the Japanese group, but in most cases somewhat higher.

### 5.3.6 Positive motivation: a summary

Students who continue studying Japanese after Year 10 report being very strongly motivated by the prospects of using the language in their future job, the fact that they like studying languages, like studying foreign cultures, and that they possess definite plans to work in an area where Japanese is used. Good marks they received in previous years are an important factor in their decision to continue studying the language. They also claim that past contact with Japan has been an important motivating factor for them. The importance of the six motives was reported by the students in this order with the first reaching the high percentage of 73% and the last 39.1%. For details see Table 5.1.

| Japanese group                     |      | Total sample                       |      |
|------------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|
| Category                           | %    | Category                           | %    |
| 1. Enhancing future career         | 73.0 | 1. Enhancing future career         | 64.0 |
| 2. Liking languages                | 54.8 | 2. Liking languages                | 58.3 |
| 3. Liking culture                  | 53.4 | 3. Good marks                      | 54.0 |
| 4. Work plans                      | 51.7 | 4. Liking culture                  | 47.2 |
| 5. Good marks                      | 40.5 | 5. Contact with country            | 44.6 |
| 6. Contact with country            | 39.1 | 6. Contact in Australia            | 33.6 |
| 7. Family advice                   | 31.3 | 7. Family advice                   | 31.3 |
| 8. Contact in Australia            | 26.9 | 8. Work plans                      | 30.9 |
| 9. Teacher advice                  | 20.9 | 9. Easy subject                    | 30.5 |
| 10. Easy subject                   | 16.1 | 10. Ethnic origin                  | 29.4 |
| 11. Liking teacher                 | 13.8 | 11. Teacher advice                 | 24.2 |
| 12. Other subjects less attractive | 13.0 | 12. Liking teacher                 | 22.4 |
| 13. Friends taking                 | 7.8  | 13. Other subjects less attractive | 14.1 |
| 14. Ethnic origin                  | 2.5  | 14. Friends taking                 | 12.8 |

Table 5.1  
Factors in positive motivation

All these motives are also the top factors within the whole sample. The first two motives are the same but 'good marks' occupy the third position and 'definite work plans' are moved to the eighth position after 'contact with ethnic community in Australia' and 'family advice'.

'Family advice' and 'contact with the Japanese community in Australia' follow in the Japanese group as numbers seven and eight. After these come 'teacher advice', 'easy subject', 'like the teacher', 'other subjects less attractive', 'friend is taking' and 'ethnic origin'.

In the overall sample the order is not much different. However, 'easy subject' and 'ethnic origin' are somewhat upgraded, compared with the Japanese group. 'Easy subject' comes as number nine and this is followed by 'ethnic origin'. Then the remaining four motives follow in the same order.

Overall, the reported motives receive more contrasting ratings by the Japanese group than in the sample as a whole. For example, the top motive has been rated as important (rating 3 and 4) by 73% of the Japanese group, but only by 64% of the sample. On the other hand, five motives receive ratings under 20% in the Japanese group, while in the sample this only occurs in the case of two motives.

Only 'definite work plans' are placed higher on the scale by the Japanese group. On the other hand, 'good marks' and 'easy subject' are placed lower and in all other cases where the order is the same, the rating is lower than in the sample.

All this together creates the impression that the Japanese group is highly motivated and more mature.

## 5.4 Negative Motivation: Reasons for Discontinuation

In the previous section the respondents were those students who still studied Japanese in Year 11. In this section we shall deal with students who discontinued the study of language after Year 10.

As explained above, the sample used in this project included 2,141 students who studied at least one language in Year 10. In fact, 362 students studied two languages. In Year 11 1,113 (52%) of those who studied LOTE 1 in Year 10, and 242 (66.8%) of those who studied LOTE 2, discontinued their language studies. The average discontinuation rate for LOTE 1 and LOTE 2 was 53.1%. In the case of the Japanese group, out of the total of 270 students who studied Japanese either as LOTE 1 or LOTE 2 in Year 10, 163 students discontinued. This is 60.4% of the group.

Concerning reasons for discontinuation, the questionnaire does not easily allow the examination of all types of motivation. We shall therefore follow the structure of the questionnaire and summarise the discussion later.

### 5.4.1 Students who did not wish to continue and students who discontinued unwillingly

The questionnaire was designed to make it possible to distinguish between responses introduced by the sentences 'I did not wish to continue ...' and 'I would have liked to continue, however...'. In the Japanese group 67.6% of all responses were in the former group, while the latter included 32.4% of responses. This contrasts with 63.7% and 36.3% of the whole sample (see Table 5.2).

| Japanese group                        |      | Total sample                          |      |
|---------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------------|------|
| Question                              | %    | Question                              | %    |
| <u>I did not wish to continue</u>     | 67.6 | <u>I did not wish to continue</u>     | 63.7 |
| 1. The subject was too difficult      | 44.8 | 1. Other reasons                      | 39.9 |
| 2. Other reasons                      | 38.0 | 2. The subject was too difficult      | 35.4 |
| 3. I do not like languages            | 24.5 | 3. I did not like the teacher         | 22.9 |
| 4. I did not like the teacher         | 21.5 | 4. I do not like languages            | 16.5 |
| 5. Too many native speakers           | 8.0  | 5. Too many native speakers           | 9.4  |
| 6. No friends taking the language     | 4.3  | 6. No friends taking the language     | 4.3  |
| <u>I would have liked to continue</u> | 32.4 | <u>I would have liked to continue</u> | 36.3 |
| 1. Other subjects more important      | 42.9 | 1. Other subjects more important      | 44.9 |
| 2. Other reasons                      | 12.3 | 2. Other reasons                      | 12.2 |
| 3. Time clashes                       | 9.2  | 3. Time clashes                       | 12.2 |
| 4. Language not available             | 3.1  | 4. Language not available             | 3.8  |

Table 5.2  
Factors in negative motivation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

### 5.4.2 Students who did not wish to continue

The difficulty of the subject is a motive that is most commonly given both in the Japanese group (44.8% of respondents) and in the whole sample (35.7% of respondents) by students who reported that they did not wish to continue. The Japanese group rate is 9% higher than the average for the whole sample. It is tempting to assume that this response is due to the fact that Japanese is intrinsically difficult for Australian students. However, it is interesting to note that Arabic, Italian and Spanish are perceived by discontinuing students to be even more difficult than Japanese and that Chinese and French are also close to 40%. The lower average percentage of the whole sample is due to the perceived easiness of languages such as Greek, Indonesian and German.

Thus, the difficulty of the subject is quoted as an important reason for discontinuation by a large number of students, but in this respect Japanese is not much different from a number of other languages, some of which (Italian or Spanish) should not be rated by English speakers (to say nothing about students with a background in the language) as difficult. In interpreting these responses, we should not forget that the students do not report about the difficulty of the language but the subject. The curriculum of the subject may be difficult even if the language itself is relatively easy for the students.

Of course, we should not forget that students who reported in this section of the survey were explaining their negative action - dropping a subject - and can therefore be expected to have assumed a defensive attitude. The questionnaire did not give them much choice. They could have escaped by ticking 'other' (38% of the Japanese group, indeed, did). Alternatively they could explain their action by claiming that they disliked languages (24.5% of the Japanese group) or that they did not like the teacher (21.5% of the Japanese sample). The other two available choices drew little response: 'there were too many native speakers' was quoted by 8% of respondents, while 'my friends did not take the language' was given as the reason for discontinuation by only 4.3% of the Japanese group.

### 5.4.3 Students who discontinued unwillingly

Under 'I would have liked to continue, however...' the reason given for discontinuation most often, both by the Japanese group and by the whole sample, was 'I considered other subjects more important for my overall study plan'. The percentage for the Japanese group was 42.9%, while in the sample 44.9% of respondents reported in this way.

The factor is real and no doubt reflects the actual reasons for discontinuation. Students plan their future and select subjects. They cannot take more than a certain number and in the case of 'good students' there is considerable pressure on them to select science subjects in the first instance. Languages tend to be considered a soft option. In other words, languages are discriminated against - not by schools or teachers, but by the general atmosphere of the community,

supported by the universities which favour science subjects as a prerequisite for many courses.

---

#### 5.4.4 Negative motivation: a summary

Obtaining reliable results for the study of negative motivation through a questionnaire is even more difficult than studying positive motivation in this way. Respondents are under pressure to legitimise their choice. Often they realise that they wanted to select other subjects, including languages, but gave in to pressure from parents, teachers and friends. At least some of them feel guilty for having made a choice that does not agree with their 'heart'.

It is of interest to note that both those who explained their decision as their own initiative ('I did not wish to continue') and those who put the responsibility on external circumstances ('I would have liked to continue, however...') most often quote social motivation for their decision. They either say that the subject was too difficult (ie, they would not be able to achieve good marks) or that they considered other subjects more important. The next most commonly given explanations use affective motivation: dislike of languages and dislike of teachers. These, of course, are the two main categories for negative motivation in general.

We assume that the reasons for discontinuation are more complicated than our survey instruments could show. In the process of deciding which subjects students should take or discontinue, both positive and negative motivations play an important role. Each positive motivation, eg, interactive motivation, can have a number of values. This is measured against negative motivations. One important contribution of our survey is the indication that social motivation (intervention of parents, teachers, the role of good marks, overall planning of the students' future, etc) forms a group of very important factors which can override affective and other factors.

---

## 6 CAREER DESTINATIONS OF GRADUATES AND THEIR USAGE OF JAPANESE

### 6.1 Data Collection

A survey of graduates of Japanese courses at Australian tertiary institutions was conducted in order to determine how they were employed and to what extent they were using their Japan-related expertise. All institutions identified as having programs incorporating a major in Japanese which had been established for at least three years were contacted and asked to assist by providing lists of graduates' names and addresses or by mailing out surveys to graduates directly. Many institutions were unable or unwilling to provide such information while others were only able to supply lists of those completing their studies very recently. Over 900 questionnaires were sent in mid-1992 to graduates of nine institutions and 338 responses were received. This represents a return rate of approximately 37%. The largest number of responses was from graduates of Monash University, which also provided the widest spread of years of graduation. This is probably attributable to the size and long history of the Japanese program at Monash and hence the large number of graduates, the existence of comprehensive lists of names and addresses and the fact that the researcher was known to a large number of Monash graduates. Information about graduates who completed their courses before 1990 was only available from four institutions: Monash University, the University of Sydney, the University of Canberra and Curtin University of Technology (with one respondent also from the University of Adelaide). The letter which accompanied the questionnaire emphasised the fact that responses were required from all graduates, whether or not they were using their Japanese skills.

Table 6.1 shows the number of respondents from each institution. The sample probably contains a number of biases, discussed above. In addition, those lists which were obtained were probably biased in favour of graduates who had maintained an interest in Japanese, as departments are more likely to have up-to-date records of graduates who have maintained contact over the years. Finally, those with an ongoing interest in Japanese were more likely to have been motivated to respond to the questionnaire.

| Institution                      | No. of questionnaires sent | No. of respondents |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Monash University                | 371                        | 141 (41.7%)        |
| University of Sydney             | 209                        | 68 (20.1%)         |
| University of Adelaide           | 50*                        | 30 (8.9%)          |
| University of Western Australia  | 75*                        | 31 (9.2%)          |
| University of Canberra           | 74*                        | 23 (6.8%)          |
| Curtin University of Technology  | 90*                        | 16 (4.7%)          |
| La Trobe University              | 20*                        | 13 (3.8%)          |
| University of Queensland         | 14                         | 8 (2.4%)           |
| University of Central Queensland | 14                         | 3 (0.9%)           |
| Other/unknown                    |                            | 5 (1.5%)           |
| All                              | 917                        | 338                |

Table 6.1

*Institution of graduation (first degree)*  
 \*Questionnaires sent out by institutions

In cases where surveys were sent directly by institutions to their graduates on behalf of the researchers it was sometimes not possible to verify the exact number sent. Such cases are marked with an asterisk in Table 6.1. The number of surveys given in these cases corresponds to the number which the institution requested in order to send out.

The 'other/unknown' category in Table 6.1 includes respondents who did not specify the institution from which they graduated or where the institution from which they obtained their first degree was not one of the institutions included in the survey. In these cases, respondents had a postgraduate degree from one of the institutions surveyed.

## 6.2 Qualifications

This section discusses the undergraduate, postgraduate and other qualifications of the graduates, including their experience in Japan.

### 6.2.1 Undergraduate qualifications

Table 6.2 gives the undergraduate qualifications of the graduates. Twenty-two respondents listed two undergraduate degrees. The first-listed degree has been recorded in column 1 in Table 6.2 and the second-listed in column 2.

| Qualification               | First listed |       | Second listed |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------|---------------|
| BA                          | 227          | 67.2% |               |
| BA (Hons)                   | 60           | 17.7% | 2             |
| BEC                         | 26           | 7.7%  |               |
| Other                       | 12           | 3.5%  | 11            |
| LLB/BA                      | 8            | 2.4%  | 6             |
| Unknown (no response given) | 3            | 0.9%  |               |
| BEC (Hons)                  | 1            | 0.3%  | 2             |
| BSc                         | 1            | 0.3%  | 1             |
| All                         | 338          |       | 22            |

Table 6.2  
Undergraduate qualifications

The undergraduate qualification of the overwhelming majority of respondents (84.9%) was an Arts degree, over a quarter of which were Honours degrees (17.7% of the total number of respondents). Not all of these were necessarily Honours degrees in Japanese although the fact that 22% of students claimed to have studied Japanese for four years at the undergraduate level (see below) indicates that most of them probably were. The high number of Arts students reflects the fact that Japanese departments or units in the institutions represented are typically part of the Arts Faculty, that in the past most Japanese students were in fact Arts students and also that lists of graduates majoring in Japanese may have been more complete for Arts graduates. Current enrolments suggest that students of Japanese now come from a much broader mix of courses. For example, in first year language courses at Monash in 1992 only 31% of students were enrolled in a straight Arts degree. The second largest source of enrolments was the Bachelor of Commerce (10%), with 7% from the Bachelor of Economics course



and 8% from the combined BA/BCom course. However by third year the proportion of Arts students had risen to 55%.

#### 6.2.1.1 Subjects taken in undergraduate course: Japanese

Graduates targeted for this survey were those with a major in Japanese. Seventy-two per cent of respondents had studied Japanese for three years at the undergraduate level, 22% for four years and 6% for less than three years. This latter category probably included students with previous background in Japanese who were given exemptions from studying first year units in institutions without both beginners' and advanced levels within their first year program.

The majority of those who had studied Japanese for four years were Honours graduates, but a small number were enrolled in combined degree courses which allowed for study of language subjects over four years or had completed undergraduate level study additional to that required by a major.

#### 6.2.1.2 Other disciplines

Respondents were asked to indicate all disciplines other than Japanese which they had studied for two or more years. The results are set out in Table 6.3.

| Subject or discipline                        | No. | %     |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| Other language                               | 123 | 36.4% |
| Linguistics                                  | 46  | 13.6% |
| Literature/English                           | 27  | 8.0%  |
| Philosophy                                   | 8   | 2.4%  |
| History                                      | 41  | 12.1% |
| Music/Creative arts/Architecture             | 18  | 5.3%  |
| Psychology                                   | 20  | 5.9%  |
| Sociology/Anthropology                       | 23  | 6.8%  |
| Economics/Economic history/Accounting        | 59  | 17.4% |
| Politics                                     | 43  | 12.7% |
| Business studies/Marketing                   | 25  | 7.4%  |
| Geography                                    | 16  | 4.7%  |
| Law                                          | 23  | 6.8%  |
| Science/Maths/Computing/Engineering/Medicine | 24  | 7.1%  |
| Other                                        | 22  | 6.5%  |

Table 6.3  
*Disciplines other than Japanese language studied for two or more years (N=338)*

The most popular discipline is 'other language', with over a third of respondents having studied another language for two or more years. The next most popular area was economics / accounting (17.4%), although if business studies / marketing is added to this grouping the proportion rises to 24.8%. Linguistics (13.6%) was the third, and politics the fourth most popular discipline (12.7%). In general, the social science subjects (sociology / anthropology, economics, politics, business studies and geography) were strongly represented with a total of 186 enrolments. Within the humanities area, apart from language and linguistics, history was the most popular discipline (12.1%) but the humanities were in general not as strongly represented as might be

expected from the fact that 84.9% of respondents were Arts graduates. Apart from the humanities and social sciences there were small numbers in the scientific disciplines including maths and engineering (7.1%) and a similar proportion in law (6.8%). In the light of recent trends it is likely that these proportions will increase in the future.

## 6.2.2 Postgraduate qualifications

Approximately a third of respondents had postgraduate qualifications. The types of qualifications held are given in Table 6.4 below.

| Qualification                                                 | No. | %     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| Diploma                                                       | 86  | 25.4% |
| MA                                                            | 28  | 8.3%  |
| PhD                                                           | 4   | 1.2%  |
| Other                                                         | 13  | 3.8%  |
| Total number of graduates with one or more PG qualifications* | 114 | 33.7% |

Table 6.4  
Postgraduate qualifications (N=338)

\*17 respondents listed more than one postgraduate qualification

In addition, 77 respondents indicated that they were currently studying for a postgraduate qualification. It is clear that the respondents to the survey are a highly qualified group especially as nearly half of them had only graduated since 1990 and therefore had had limited opportunity to acquire higher qualifications. As might be expected, those employed in the education sector were the most highly qualified, 48% holding a Diploma, 17% an MA, 4% a PhD and 4% another qualification. Those in education accounted for 56% of the Diplomas, 65% of the MAs, all of the PhDs and 33% of the other qualifications. However in all sectors it was apparent that graduates have experienced a need for ongoing training and re training, resulting in higher qualifications.

In order to gain a more detailed picture of the postgraduate qualifications of graduates, the responses of the 141 Monash graduates (the sub-group with the fullest coverage of less recent graduates) were analysed more comprehensively.

| Qualification                                                | First | Subsequent | In progress | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|-------------|-------|
| Diploma in Education                                         | 29    |            | 1           | 30    |
| Diploma/one year interpreting certificate                    | 5     | 4          | 8           | 17    |
| Masters - Japan-related (including Japanese degrees)         | 7     | 1          |             | 8     |
| PhD - Japan-related                                          | 1     | 1          |             | 2     |
| Diploma - non-Japan related                                  | 5     |            | 7           | 12    |
| Masters - non-Japan related                                  | 6     | 2          | 2           | 10    |
| PhD - non-Japan related                                      | 1     |            |             | 1     |
| Total number of respondents with postgraduate qualifications | 54    | 8          | 18          | 72    |

Table 6.5  
Postgraduate qualifications of Monash graduates

Fifty-four respondents (38% of Monash respondents) had postgraduate qualifications, while eight of these had more than one postgraduate qualification. Eighteen, most of whom were recent graduates, were currently enrolled in a postgraduate program. Over half of the graduates (29) possessed a

Diploma in Education while smaller numbers had acquired other qualifications. These were fairly evenly divided between Japan-related and non-Japan related degrees. When examining the studies in progress of the more recent graduates it is noteworthy that only one is enrolled in a Diploma in Education course while eight are enrolled in Diploma courses in Japan-related areas, and the remaining nine are presently acquiring non-Japan related qualifications. This reflects the declining interest among graduates in education as a career (which will be discussed in a later section) and the increase in availability of coursework Diplomas in Japanese Studies (such as the Monash Diploma in Japanese Business Communication) which allow graduates to extend their formal language study and study of Japan itself beyond their undergraduate training.

While the increase in availability of coursework postgraduate programs is a positive step, the survey indicates that the growth in numbers at this level has not been matched by a similar increase in enrolments in research-based degrees. Returning to the overall sample, perhaps the most alarming aspect of the survey results in the area of postgraduate qualifications is the fact that while at first sight a large proportion of respondents appear to have higher qualifications, the majority are Diplomas, which are held by 25% of respondents (Table 6.4), over half of which are Diplomas in Education. Graduates holding Master's degrees in Japan-related areas are relatively few, while those with PhDs are even more scarce. In fact, while four respondents (1%) hold a PhD, only two of these are in Japan-related areas. While the bias in the survey results towards recent graduates may partly account for the lack of respondents undertaking research degrees, other sections of this report confirm that this is indeed a real problem. This failure of Australian undergraduates of Japanese departments to proceed to research-based degrees, particularly to PhD level, must be cause for concern because it is evident that, particularly with the current rate of growth in Japanese language and studies in this country and around the world (Coulmas 1989; Marriott 1992), the academic profession is not reproducing itself fast enough to cope with the demand. This problem is treated in more depth in other sections of this report.

Table 6.6, which records the content of postgraduate courses, indicates that postgraduate study by thesis alone was comparatively rare, as would be expected from the preponderance of Diplomas.

| Components included in postgraduate course (complete and in progress) | No. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Japanese language subjects                                            | 59  |
| Other Japan-related subjects                                          | 39  |
| Other subjects                                                        | 48  |
| Research thesis - sole component                                      | 11  |
| Research thesis - part component                                      | 38  |

Table 6.6  
*Course-work and research components included in postgraduate studies (N=114)*

Approximately 51% of respondents who had undertaken postgraduate study had studied Japanese language subjects at the postgraduate level while a lesser proportion (34%) had studied other Japan-related subjects. A three-year undergraduate major does not necessarily equip students with the proficiency required for professional use of Japanese, particularly in specialised areas, and the number of those undertaking further study is an indication that many graduates feel the need to continue their formal study of the language as well as

of other Japan-related areas. It also reflects the growing availability of such coursework at the postgraduate level. However, it is still the case that only half of those undertaking higher degrees took any subjects in the Japanese language, and the proportion of all graduates undertaking such studies was only about 17%. There is certainly room for further expansion in the provision of postgraduate coursework at an advanced level in both Japanese language and studies. Courses catering for specialised areas of interest are particularly necessary in order to ensure that graduates are able to expand on the basic skills they acquire in undergraduate programs.

One area which perhaps deserves particular comment, due both to its importance to the future of Japanese studies in Australia at the pre-tertiary level and to the fact that it is such a common area of further study for graduates, is the Diploma in Education. Traditionally, education faculties have assumed that students will acquire adequate specialist skills in their undergraduate degrees; however in the case of Japanese (and perhaps of other languages) this assumption is no longer realistic. Employers such as the Department of School Education in Victoria are demanding minimum competency levels exceeding those which can be achieved in a standard undergraduate degree. In Victoria, the levels required of newly qualifying teachers from 1996 will be equivalent to a four-year sequence in Japanese for those who commence their language studies at university. In addition, there are many aspects of classroom language which cannot be covered adequately in general undergraduate courses. Given these facts and the evidence from this survey and other sources of the decline in interest in teaching as a career, provision of language training during post-graduate teacher training courses would be an important way of both raising professional standards and broadening the pool of potential teachers. (See also Section 4.6.)

Forty-two per cent of those undertaking postgraduate study studied at least some non-Japan related subjects, some as part of non-Japan related qualifications and some as part of qualifications which also included Japan-related study. This reflects the fact that many Japanese graduates add qualifications suited to their area of employment after they have finished their initial degree.

### 6.2.3 Other training

Respondents were asked if they had undertaken other types of training to enhance their employment/career prospects. The results (recorded in Table 6.7) show that non-degree training in Japanese and in computing were the most popular areas. The 'other' category covered a large range of areas, including a number related to the hospitality and tourism industry, such as tour guide training courses.

| Type of non-degree training            | No. |
|----------------------------------------|-----|
| Secretarial                            | 37  |
| Business/office administration         | 26  |
| Computing                              | 55  |
| Teacher training (not for degree)      | 26  |
| Marketing/advertising/public relations | 25  |
| Technical or professional development  | 40  |
| Japanese language                      | 51  |
| Other                                  | 39  |

Table 6.7  
Other training

#### 6.2.4 Time spent in Japan

When examining the qualifications of graduates in Japanese the issue of experience in Japan is a relevant one, whether or not this experience was obtained as part of a formal qualification.

Only 20.9% of the respondents had spent no time in Japan, although a further 24.5% had spent less than 6 months in the country. Table 6.8 gives the amount of time spent in Japan, while Table 6.9 gives details of how that time was spent. A significant number of graduates had spent time in Japan as high school exchange students (22.4%) or as part of their Australian university program (16.7%) and a slightly lower number had studied in Japan in other programs.

| Time in Japan      | No. | %     |
|--------------------|-----|-------|
| None               | 70  | 20.9% |
| Less than 6 months | 82  | 24.5% |
| 6-12 months        | 51  | 15.2% |
| 1-2 years          | 69  | 20.6% |
| 2-5 years          | 40  | 11.9% |
| More than 5 years  | 23  | 6.9%  |
| All                | 335 |       |

Table 6.8  
Time spent in Japan

| Activities in Japan                               | No. | %     |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| High school exchange student (more than 6 months) | 75  | 22.4% |
| Australian university program (eg, Honours)       | 56  | 16.7% |
| Other study at Japanese institution               | 44  | 13.1% |
| Employment (inc. working holiday over 4 months)   | 96  | 28.6% |
| Short-term travel                                 | 125 | 37.3% |
| Other                                             | 68  | 20.3% |

Table 6.9  
Details of time spent in Japan (N=335)  
(Respondents were asked to tick one or more categories, as appropriate.)

The fact that 22.4% of students had studied and lived in Japan as exchange students prior to entering university is significant, as it suggests that such an experience can have an important influence. The proportion of students who have been on an exchange enrolling in first year courses is much lower, so the high proportion of graduates responding to this survey with such experience probably reflects the fact that these students tend to persist with their Japanese studies and are more likely to seek employment in Japan-related areas.

We can assume that the majority of those who studied in Japan as part of their Australian university program did so in their Honours year (the total number of those completing Arts degrees with Honours was 60), although this situation is changing as institutions adopt more diverse programs. Even greater numbers (28.6%) had spent time working in Japan (including working holidays of over four months duration). Of course, some of these respondents also studied in Japan at some stage.

The fact that many students and graduates are gaining exposure to Japan through work experience is probably due to such factors as relative ease in obtaining visas and employment under the Working Holiday Scheme, attractive rates of pay in Japan and poor employment prospects in Australia. At the same time, we have noted that the option of studying in Japan is being viewed as less attractive by many students, because of the cost involved and the increased availability of other options for gaining experience in Japan. Increasing numbers of students are deciding not to proceed with further formal study after completing their basic degrees because of the high costs involved, and are instead deciding to spend time working in Japan, both to improve their Japan-related skills and to gain experience. This trend is one which needs to be recognised, and the opportunities for combining work and study at both the undergraduate and the postgraduate level need to be explored so that students are able to gain maximum advantage from their in-country experience. Courses including work experience components in Japan are already being offered by institutions such as Swinburne University of Technology.

Twenty-seven per cent of respondents (90) indicated that they had received some kind of scholarship or assistance to study in Japan. However, it is increasingly the case that study in Japan is beyond the reach of most students without some form of financial assistance. Although a combination of work and study may suit some students, particularly those wishing to gain work experience, it is not suitable for all students. Those wishing to conduct research or to pursue an intensive study program require adequate financial assistance to enable them to do so. It is essential that such support programs are expanded to enable more students to study in Japan in future.

### 6.3 Employment

Of the 326 graduates who responded to a question regarding employment status, only 56.1% were employed on a full-time basis. However those who indicated that they were unemployed (other than by choice) numbered only 4.6%. The interpretation of these figures (presented in Table 6.10) is made more difficult by the fact that the questionnaire did not include a category for those who were full-time students, although a large number of respondents fell into this group. Some of the 77 respondents who were engaged in postgraduate study were full-time students, while there were other respondents who were completing the final year of an undergraduate course (although already having completed a major in Japanese.) Full figures could not be calculated due to incomplete information, but it is probable that the categories for those employed part-time, on a casual basis, and not in regular paid employment included many full-time students.



| Employment status                              | No. | %     |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| Employed full-time                             | 183 | 56.1% |
| Employed on a part-time or fractional basis    | 39  | 12.0% |
| Employed on a casual basis                     | 47  | 14.4% |
| Not in regular paid employment - by choice     | 42  | 12.9% |
| Not in regular paid employment - not by choice | 15  | 4.6%  |
| All                                            | 326 |       |

Table 6.10  
Employment status

More than half of the respondents had been in their present jobs for 12 months or less, 42.8% for less than six months. These figures were obviously influenced by the relatively high proportion of recent graduates. The figures for duration of current position are set out in Table 6.11 below.

| Period employed in current position | No. | %    |
|-------------------------------------|-----|------|
| 0-6 months                          | 145 | 42.9 |
| 6-12 months                         | 37  | 0.9  |
| 1-2 years                           | 50  | 14.8 |
| 2-5 years                           | 80  | 23.7 |
| 5 years or more                     | 26  | 7.7  |
| All                                 | 338 |      |

Table 6.11  
Duration of employment in current position

### 6.3.1 Sector of employment and employer

One of the main purposes of the present study was to determine what areas of employment are entered by graduates, and whether or not the relative importance of these areas is changing. Respondents to the questionnaire who were currently employed were asked to indicate both the sector of their employment and their employer, in both cases being asked to choose from a list of options.<sup>4</sup>

When examining the sector of employment it is important to remember that many of the graduates from 1990 on had not yet entered the full-time work-force, but were employed in casual positions to support themselves through further study. This casual employment in jobs such as waiting and tutoring has boosted the numbers in the categories of education, retail, and hospitality and tourism in particular, and thus care should be exercised in the interpretation of the figures.

As has been shown in past surveys (Spence-Brown 1992) the education sector employs the biggest percentage of graduates, with 28.8% of those who are in employment (Table 6.12). However, the proportion of graduates employed within this sector is much higher for graduates up to 1979 (58%) than for those

<sup>4</sup> Examination of the data generated by the original computer analysis of the question about sector of employment revealed a high number of responses in the 'other' category, many of which could be classified in the existing categories. Consequently, the questionnaires were re-analysed by hand for this question, and the results are presented in Table 6.12. In order to improve the clarity and usefulness of results some categories were broken down into sub-categories. In other tables in this chapter which involved cross-analysis of sector of employment with other categories, the original computer-generated data were used, leading to some discrepancies in the categories and numbers.



from 1980 to 1989 (29%), despite the huge expansion of Japanese (and thus of demand for teachers) at all levels during that decade. The proportion of 1990-graduates in this sector is even lower, but as many graduates in this category are still completing their studies, the figures are not an accurate indication of the numbers who will eventually enter the education sector. The falling proportion of graduates in education reflects the greatly expanded range of occupations available to Japanese graduates, particularly women, in the last decade or so. While this greater diversity of employment is to be welcomed, the decline in attractiveness of teaching as a profession is some cause for concern.

| Sectors of employment                   | Year of graduation |                 |                 |                 |           | Total      | %            |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
|                                         | 1959-79            | 1980-84         | 1985-89         | 1990-           | Not known |            |              |
| Primary education(Japanese)             | 1                  |                 | * 4             |                 |           | 5          | 1.9%         |
| Secondary education (Japanese)          | 2                  | 5               | 13              | 11              |           | 31         | 11.6%        |
| Secondary education (non-Japanese)      | 1                  | 2               |                 |                 |           | 3          | 1.1%         |
| Tertiary education (Japanese)           | 2                  | 1               | 5               | 1               |           | 9          | 3.4%         |
| Tertiary ed (non-Japanese)              | 1                  |                 | 2               |                 |           | 3          | 1.1%         |
| Teaching English in Japan/Australia     | 1                  | 1               | 4               | 4               |           | 10         | 3.7%         |
| Other education                         | 3                  | 1               | 2               | 10              |           | 16         | 6.0%         |
| <b>Education (total)</b>                | <b>11 (58%)</b>    | <b>10 (27%)</b> | <b>30 (30%)</b> | <b>26 (24%)</b> |           | <b>77</b>  | <b>28.8%</b> |
| Public sector-Australia                 | 1 (5%)             | 9 (24%)         | 11 (11%)        | 8 (7%)          |           | 29         | 10.9%        |
| Public sector-foreign                   |                    |                 | 5 (5%)          | 2 (2%)          | 1         | 8          | 3.0%         |
| Finance/banking etc                     |                    | 3 (8%)          | 5 (5%)          | 6 (5%)          |           | 14         | 5.2%         |
| Retail                                  |                    | 1 (3%)          | 3 (3%)          | 18 (17%)        |           | 22         | 8.2%         |
| Hospitality/tourism                     |                    | 3 (8%)          | 16 (16%)        | 26 (24%)        | 2         | 47         | 17.6%        |
| Media/publishing                        |                    | 2 (5%)          | 1 (1%)          | 1 (1%)          |           | 4          | 1.5%         |
| Interpreting/translating (Japanese)     | 1 (5%)             | 2 (5%)          | 2 (2%)          | 1 (1%)          |           | 6          | 2.2%         |
| Interpreting/translating (non-Japanese) |                    |                 | 1 (1%)          |                 |           | 1          | 0.4%         |
| Other service industry                  | 3 (16%)            | 1 (3%)          | 11 (11%)        | 9 (8%)          | 1         | 25         | 9.4%         |
| Secondary industry                      |                    | 1 (3%)          | 1 (1%)          | 3 (3%)          |           | 5          | 1.9%         |
| Primary industry                        | 1 (5%)             |                 | 2 (2%)          |                 |           | 3          | 1.1%         |
| International trade                     |                    |                 | 3 (3%)          | 1 (1%)          |           | 4          | 1.5%         |
| Law                                     | 1 (5%)             | 2 (5%)          | 4 (4%)          | 3 (3%)          |           | 10         | 3.7%         |
| Other                                   | 1 (5%)             | 3 (8%)          | 5 (5%)          | 3 (3%)          |           | 12         | 4.5%         |
| <b>All</b>                              | <b>19</b>          | <b>37</b>       | <b>100</b>      | <b>107</b>      | <b>4</b>  | <b>267</b> |              |

Table 6.12

Sector of employment categorised by year of graduation

\* 3 of these teach at both primary and secondary levels (they have not been included again under secondary)

| Employer                                                               | No.        | %     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|
| Australian educational institution                                     | 59         | 22.0% |
| Australian public service                                              | 33         | 12.3% |
| Australian firm or non-Government organisation over 100 employees      | 37         | 13.8% |
| Australian firm or non-Government organisation less than 100 employees | 29         | 10.8% |
| Japanese firm or subsidiary                                            | 45         | 16.8% |
| Other foreign or multi-national firm                                   | 15         | 5.6%  |
| Japanese or other foreign govt/semi-govt organisation                  | 12         | 4.5%  |
| Self-employed                                                          | 16         | 6.0%  |
| Other                                                                  | 22         | 8.2%  |
| <b>All</b>                                                             | <b>268</b> |       |

Table 6.13

Type of employer

While the majority of graduates in the education sector are employed in the teaching of Japanese at various levels of the education system in Australia, significant numbers are teaching in unrelated fields such as ESL. An examination of the different levels of the education system reveals a number of relatively recent graduates in the new field of primary Japanese education (only 1.9% overall, but nearly 4% of the 1985-89 graduates). The expansion of this sector is actually greater than indicated by this survey (as is revealed elsewhere in this report), because the surveyed institutions do not include the main primary teacher training providers. The largest number of graduates is still employed in the secondary sector (11.6%), while the tertiary sector employs 3.4%. Amongst those employed in other sectors of education there were several who were employed as training consultants to industry in Japan-related areas.

The second highest employer of graduates is the hospitality/tourism industry, which employs 17.6% of graduates overall. The strong growth of this sector since the beginning of the eighties is apparent if the percentages are broken down in terms of year of graduation. No graduates from before 1980 are employed in this sector, while for the period 1980-84 the figure is 8%, rising to 16% for the second half of the eighties and to nearly a quarter of the recent graduates (1990-) who are currently in the work-force. However, a large number of this latter group are only employed on a casual basis and may not stay in the industry. This sector is obviously one of growing importance, and evidence which will be discussed in the Section 6.3.2 on salary suggests that a number of graduates have established career paths taking them into management areas within this industry. However, one cause for concern is the fact that a detailed examination of the questionnaire responses indicated that most of those employed in this sector worked for Japanese companies. Tourism is an area where good linguistic and cultural skills are essential to success, but on the evidence of this small sample Australian companies do not appear to be employing graduates with these skills.

The Australian public sector is the third largest sector of employment, with 10.9%. The largest proportion of graduates employed by the public sector is 24% for those graduating between 1980 and 1984, rising from 5% in the preceding decades and falling away to 11% in the latter half of the eighties. However, as will be seen later, of those employed in the public service, very few were using their Japan-related skills.

A previous survey of Monash graduates (Spence-Brown 1992) had found a relatively high number of graduates (12.6%) in the finance sector, almost all of whom had graduated since 1980. However the present survey does not show the same result, with only 5% of graduates employed in this sector. (When Monash graduates alone are examined the figure is still less than 8%.) These figures may reflect a temporary increase at the time of the last survey (in the boom-times of 1988) which ended with the advent of the recession. Although the proportion of graduates was not as high as had been found previously, the number of graduates in this sector is still relatively high, especially compared with areas such as primary and secondary industry. Economics is one of the most common non-Arts subjects to be combined with Japanese (see Table 6.3) and an economics degree is the second most common undergraduate qualification of Japanese graduates after an Arts degree (see Table 6.2) so this is not surprising. Evidence from graduates also suggests that a number of financial institutions (both Japanese owned and

non-Japanese owned) actively recruit Japanese-speaking staff, and are prepared to give them extra job-specific training where necessary in a way which does not seem to occur commonly in most other industries.

A small but significant number of graduates (3.7%) was employed in the legal profession. The other professions were not represented, apart from one engineer, and one student about to graduate as an architect. It is to be hoped that this situation will improve as combined degree courses become more common.

Other service industries (including retail, 8.2% - mostly recent graduates in casual employment - and interpreting/translating, 2.2%, marketing, public relations, consulting and several others) account for the majority of the remaining graduates. One of the most worrying features of this survey is the low proportion of graduates working directly in primary and secondary industries. There were only five individuals (1.9%) employed by secondary industry, one of whom worked for a Japanese company in Japan. Four were in primary industry (notably, two in each of agricultural marketing and resources marketing respectively were earning salaries over \$80,000 so presumably were in fairly senior positions) and four in 'international trade' who could not be clearly classified as being employed directly by secondary/primary industry or by other service industries (such as trading houses). Of course it is true that some of those employed as interpreters and translators, as lawyers and in the finance and other service industries are providing their expertise to Australian companies wishing to trade with Japan. However the evidence of this survey would indicate that this sector does not directly employ many Japanese graduates. Politicians often state or imply that the increased emphasis on Japanese language education at all levels is aimed at improving Australia's performance in trading with Japan, but it appears that this has not led to an increase in the employment of graduates in these areas.

It is often stated that the number of Japanese speakers employed by industry is small because Japanese graduates do not have the necessary business-related qualifications. In this regard it is interesting to note the sectors of employment of those graduates with BEc and BEc(Hons). Of the 21 graduates, six were employed in the finance sector, as might be expected, making up nearly half of the graduates in this sector. Four were employed in education, and the remaining seven were employed in the hospitality industry. Significantly, none were employed in other areas of business, industry or Government.

In terms of the benefit which Australia derives from training graduates in Japanese, it is also interesting to look at the ownership of the organisations by which they are employed. It is certainly not the case that one would expect or wish all Japanese graduates to work for Australian organisations. Given the large number of Japanese organisations and their subsidiaries operating in Australia it would be worrying if they did not employ local Australians with the linguistic and sociocultural background to be able to interact with the Japanese organisation and its Australian customers and suppliers. On the other hand, it would also be a cause for concern if all our graduates were employed by Japanese organisations, helping them to operate more effectively in the Australian environment while local organisations did not benefit from their expertise. Table 6.13 above shows that 64.9% of graduates were in fact employed by Australian companies or organisations or were self-employed, although over

half of them worked for the public service or educational institutions. Of course, not all of these graduates were working in areas related to their Japanese expertise.

### 6.3.2 Salary

Table 6.14 sets out the annual salary of the respondents, broken down according to year of graduation.

| Annual Salary      | 1959-1974 | 1975-1979 | 1980-1984 | 1985-1989 | 1990- | Year not known | Total |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------------|-------|
| less than \$20,000 | 5         | 2         | 4         | 15        | 45    | 7              | 78    |
| \$20,000-\$29,999  | 0         | 3         | 3         | 26        | 40    | 2              | 74    |
| \$30,000-\$39,999  | 1         | 2         | 17        | 34        | 10    | 1              | 65    |
| \$40,000-\$49,999  | 4         | 0         | 5         | 15        | 1     | 2              | 27    |
| \$50,000-\$59,999  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0     | 0              | 4     |
| \$60,000-\$69,999  | 2         | 2         | 0         | 2         | 1     | 0              | 7     |
| \$70,000-\$79,999  | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0     | 0              | 1     |
| \$80,000 and above | 0         | 3         | 5         | 3         | 0     | 0              | 11    |
| All                | 13        | 13        | 36        | 96        | 97    | 12             | 267   |

Table 6.14  
Salary

When examining the figures for salary, it must be remembered that 86 graduates were employed on a part-time or casual basis. It is likely that most of those earning less than \$20,000 and some of those earning \$20,000-\$30,000 fell into this category.

Nearly 9% of respondents to this question had salaries of over \$50,000 a year, 4.1% being over \$80,000, which represents a substantial number of highly paid graduates, considering the relatively short period in the work-force of many of the respondents.

It is notable that the earliest graduates (up to 1974) were in a relatively poor position, considering their longer years in the work-force. This is probably partly attributable to the high proportion of those who were not employed full-time, but it may also reflect the fact that they became established in their careers when demand for Japanese speakers was still low and opportunities narrow, and have not been able to move into newer, more lucrative fields.

It is also noteworthy that some of the relatively recent graduates are already receiving quite high salaries. One of those graduating since 1990 is in the \$60,000-\$69,999 range, while three of the graduates from the latter half of the eighties are already earning in excess of \$80,000. If high salaries are an indication of success in a particular field and of a high demand for certain skills then it would appear that some graduates at least are successful and in demand.

When the breakdown by sector of employment is examined it is obvious that graduates are active across a broad range of occupations, and at a range of levels within each sector. Of course, some sectors offer greater opportunities for financial reward than others.

There are clusters of graduates at the lower end of the salary range in education, hospitality / tourism, the public service and retail areas. Many of these were in part-time employment, as mentioned above.

| Salary (\$ 000)     | < 20 | 20-29.9 | 30-39.9 | 40-49.9 | 50-59.9 | 60-69.9 | 70+ | Total |
|---------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----|-------|
| Education           | 20   | 17      | 24      | 9       | 1       | 3       | 0   | 74    |
| Hospitality/tourism | 16   | 18      | 7       | 3       | 1       | 1       | 1   | 47    |
| Public sector       | 11   | 7       | 8       | 4       | 0       | 0       | 1   | 31    |
| Retail              | 13   | 2       | 1       | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0   | 16    |
| Finance./acc./bank  | 1    | 6       | 1       | 3       | 1       | 0       | 2   | 14    |
| Professions         | 1    | 3       | 4       | 2       | 0       | 0       | 2   | 12    |
| Other service ind.  | 4    | 4       | 1       | 1       | 0       | 1       | 0   | 11    |
| Interpret./trans.   | 2    | 1       | 4       | 0       | 0       | 0       | 1   | 8     |
| Media/publishing    | 1    | 1       | 0       | 1       | 0       | 0       | 0   | 3     |
| Other sec. indust.  | 1    | 0       | 1       | 1       | 0       | 0       | 0   | 3     |
| Other               | 8    | 13      | 12      | 3       | 1       | 2       | 5   | 44    |
| All                 | 78   | 72      | 63      | 27      | 4       | 7       | 12  | 263   |

Table 6.15  
Salary categorised by sector of employment

The hospitality/tourism sector is one which deserves particular comment. In a 1988 survey of Monash graduates, this sector was noted as being an area of extremely high growth, but at that stage it was not clear whether graduates would develop their careers in this sector, or whether they were engaged in low-level jobs for short periods of time. Although it is clear that such activities as casual tour guiding or waiting are often used by recent graduates to support themselves through further studies or as a fall-back while seeking permanent employment, (and that this accounts for a large number of the graduates employed in this sector), it is clear that others have established themselves at higher levels in the industry. There is a fairly strong representation in the \$30,00 - \$40,000 salary range, and individuals in each range above this as well.

## 6.4 Use of Japanese Skills in Employment

Almost 55% of graduates claim that a major or substantial part of their work is related to Japan, while 30.5% claim that it is not related (Table 6.16). Nearly half of the graduates claim to use their Japanese every day, while approximately a quarter claim that they do not use their knowledge of Japan at all in their employment (Table 6.17). Of course, as has been stated previously, the sample is probably biased to include more graduates who work in Japan-related areas but this figure is still high. If the most recent graduates are examined, the proportion working in Japan-related areas falls. This may be due to the fact that the sample was not as biased, but it also may partly be attributed to the fact that many recent graduates were working part-time in non-career positions.

One interesting result is the fact that marginally more respondents claim to use their Japanese language skills more frequently than their knowledge of Japanese culture, society and institutions. Use of language without accompanying cultural knowledge perhaps indicates low-level use of the language, or perhaps a lack of awareness of the degree to which one must draw on sociocultural knowledge in

order to communicate effectively. At the lower end of the usage scale, it is predictable that a higher number of respondents used their sociocultural knowledge than used their linguistic skills, as the former can be useful without the latter.

| Proportion of work related to Japan (%) | 59-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90+ | Unknown | Total       |
|-----------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|---------|-------------|
| A major part                            | 8     | 9     | 18    | 49    | 37  | 4       | 125 (45.4%) |
| A substantial but secondary part        | 1     | 1     | 0     | 10    | 12  | 2       | 26 (9.4%)   |
| A minor part                            | 2     | 1     | 6     | 13    | 17  | 1       | 40 (14.5%)  |
| None                                    | 2     | 4     | 13    | 25    | 33  | 7       | 84 (30.5%)  |
| All                                     | 13    | 15    | 37    | 97    | 99  | 14      | 275         |

Table 6.16  
*Proportion of work devoted to Japan categorised by year of graduation*

| Frequency             | Use of Japanese | Use of knowledge of Japanese culture, society, institutions |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Daily                 | 131 (48.0%)     | 121 (44.2%)                                                 |
| Once or twice a week  | 25 (9.2%)       | 22 (8.0%)                                                   |
| Once or twice a month | 6 (2.2%)        | 11 (4.0%)                                                   |
| Occasionally          | 36 (13.2%)      | 54 (19.7%)                                                  |
| Never                 | 75 (27.5%)      | 66 (24.1%)                                                  |
| All                   | 273             | 274                                                         |

Table 6.17  
*Frequency of use of Japanese and of knowledge of Japanese culture, society and institutions*

Table 6.18 sets out the proportion of work related to Japan categorised by sector of employment.

| Proportion of work related to Japan | Major part  | Secondary part | Minor part | None       | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|-------|
| Education                           | 52 (67.5%)  | 8 (10.4%)      | 5 (6.5%)   | 12 (15.6%) | 77    |
| Hospitality/tourism                 | 27 (57.4%)  | 5 (10.6%)      | 9 (19.1%)  | 6 (12.8%)  | 47    |
| Public sector                       | 3 (9.7%)    | 0 (0.0%)       | 4 (12.9%)  | 24 (77.4%) | 31    |
| Retail                              | 4 (25.0%)   | 1 (6.2%)       | 3 (18.7%)  | 8 (50.0%)  | 16    |
| Finance/accounting/banking          | 2 (14.3%)   | 2 (14.3%)      | 5 (35.7%)  | 5 (35.7%)  | 14    |
| Professions                         | 1 (8.3%)    | 0 (0.0%)       | 5 (41.7%)  | 6 (50.0%)  | 12    |
| Other service industry              | 3 (27.3%)   | 1 (9.1%)       | 3 (27.3%)  | 4 (36.4%)  | 11    |
| Interpreting/translating            | 5 (62.5%)   | 0 (0.0%)       | 0 (0.0%)   | 3 (37.5%)  | 8     |
| Media/publishing                    | 1 (33.3%)   | 0 (0.0%)       | 0 (0.0%)   | 2 (66.7%)  | 3     |
| Other secondary industry            | 1 (33.3%)   | 1 (33.3%)      | 0 (0.0%)   | 1 (33.3%)  | 3     |
| Other                               | 24 (52.8%)  | 7 (15.2%)      | 5 (10.9%)  | 10 (21.7%) | 46    |
| All                                 | 123 (45.9%) | 25 (9.3%)      | 39 (14.5%) | 81 (30.2%) | 268   |

Table 6.18  
*Proportion of work related to Japan categorised by sector of employment*

A discrepancy in the totals for Tables 6.16 and 6.18 is due to the fact that some respondents failed to respond to the question relating to one or the other of the categories, and the cross-tabulation only includes respondents who gave valid responses on both items.

An examination of the different sectors of employment reveals that those in education show the highest percentage of respondents claiming that a major, or else substantial but secondary part of their work is related to Japan (77.9%, ie. most of those who teach in Japan-related areas). If this sector is removed, approximately a third of graduates fall into this category. Within other sectors



the proportion is highest for hospitality/ tourism (68.0%) and of course interpreting/translating.

Within the finance sector only 14.3% consider that a major part of their work is related to Japan, but only slightly more than a third (35.7%) consider it to be totally unrelated. In the professions (predominantly law) only one respondent selected 'a major part', but 5 (41.7%) claimed that a minor part of their work was Japan-related. The public sector was the sector with the highest proportion of respondents claiming that none of their work related to Japan (77.4%), with only 9.7% who considered that a major part was related.

#### 6.4.1 Types of language skills used

As it is obviously important to know what kinds of linguistic skills graduates actually use in the work-place, graduates were asked to indicate which skills they had used in the last month. The results are given in Table 6.19, expressed as a percentage of those in employment.

| Language skills used in the last month |             |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| Spoken Japanese - simple               | 178 (66.2%) |
| Spoken Japanese - complex              | 108 (40.1%) |
| Reading                                | 126 (46.8%) |
| Writing                                | 93 (34.6%)  |
| Translating                            | 76 (28.3%)  |
| Interpreting                           | 71 (26.4%)  |

Table 6.19  
Language skills used in employment  
(N=269)

Predictably, simple conversation is the most commonly employed skill, used by 66.2% of respondents. Surprisingly, however, the next most commonly used skill is reading (46.8%), followed by complex conversation, then writing and translating and interpreting. This has implications for course design at the tertiary level. Both conversation and reading, and to a lesser extent writing, are skills used to a considerable extent in the work-place, and all need to be given adequate attention. Another interesting aspect is the extent to which translating and interpreting skills are required. General language courses, both those still using and those having rejected translation as a central tool for language teaching, often fail to recognise its importance as a skill in its own right. Few systematically equip their students with translating, and particularly interpreting skills, which do not automatically flow from competence in the two languages concerned. This survey indicates that it is not only specialised professionals who require these skills, and that there is a need for the incorporation of basic interpreting and translating in general undergraduate language programs.



### 6.4.2 Significance of Japan-related skills in careers

From Table 6.20 it can be seen that a significant number of graduates (38.8%) regard their Japan-related skills as having been of major importance to their careers. Only 11.6% have not used their skills and are unlikely to do so in future, although 23.8% do not use them as much as they would like at present. When the figures are examined in relation to the sector of employment, those which have the largest number of graduates claiming that their Japan-related skills have been of major importance are education (65%), hospitality/tourism (49%) and interpreting (67%).

| Year of graduation                                                                                                                       | 59-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90- | Total          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|----------------|
| I have not used my Japan-related skills to a significant degree in my career thus far, and am unlikely to do so in future                | 1     | 2     | 10    | 13    | 12  | 38<br>(11.6%)  |
| Although I have used my Japan-related skills in the past, I do not use them to a significant degree in my present position               | 1     | 1     | 10    | 10    | 12  | 34<br>(10.4%)  |
| I do not use my Japan-related skills as much as I would like at present but hope to find employment which utilises them better in future | 2     | 4     | 1     | 16    | 55  | 78<br>(23.8%)  |
| My Japan-related skills have been useful but are not of major importance to my career                                                    | 1     | 0     | 4     | 10    | 8   | 23<br>(7.0%)   |
| My Japan-related skills have been of major importance to my career thus far                                                              | 6     | 10    | 19    | 53    | 39  | 127<br>(38.8%) |
| None of the above                                                                                                                        | 1     | 1     | 2     | 8     | 15  | 27<br>(8.2%)   |
| All                                                                                                                                      | 12    | 18    | 46    | 110   | 141 | 327            |

Table 6.20  
*Role of Japan-related skills in career categorised by year of graduation*

### 6.5 Adequacy of Japan-related Training and Desire to Undertake Further Study

As can be seen from Table 6.21, satisfaction with Japan-related training varies considerably according to year of graduation, with the most recent graduates generally being the most dissatisfied. This is rather alarming at first glance, as one would hope that the quality of courses is increasing rather than decreasing. Perhaps it may be true that while the content is becoming more sophisticated the huge increases in student numbers in the last few years, coupled with the cutbacks in university funding, have resulted in poorer conditions for learning and teaching than in the past. It is also true that satisfaction varies markedly depending on institution of graduation, and the institutional background of respondents varies with year of graduation, the more recent years reflecting a wider range of institutions. It was not the aim of this survey to single out those institutions where satisfaction is relatively low, but it is evident that while no course gained total satisfaction from its students, some courses fared better than others.

Even where respondents were happy with the preparation provided by their courses, the results in Table 6.22 show that the overwhelming majority were considering some form of Japan-related study in the future. This can be seen as a recognition of the limitations of standard undergraduate courses (both those

regarded as satisfactory and unsatisfactory) but also a confirmation of the perceived utility of study in formal courses.

| Adequacy of preparation in language skills | 1959-74   | 1975-79   | 1980-84    | 1985-89    | 1990-      | Total      |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Good                                       | 7 (63.6%) | 7 (53.8%) | 19 (63.3%) | 36 (45.0%) | 30 (33.3%) | 99 (44.2%) |
| Fair                                       | 4 (36.4%) | 4 (30.8%) | 7 (23.3%)  | 32 (40.0%) | 43 (47.8%) | 90 (40.2%) |
| Inadequate                                 | 0         | 2 (15.4%) | 4 (13.3%)  | 12 (15.0%) | 17 (18.9%) | 35 (15.6%) |
| All                                        | 11        | 13        | 30         | 80         | 90         | 224        |

Table 6.21

*Satisfaction with language training categorised by year of graduation*

| Interest in pursuing further studies in Japan-related areas in future | No.         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Yes                                                                   | 184 (55.4%) |
| No                                                                    | 32 (9.6%)   |
| Possibly                                                              | 114 (34.3%) |
| Other                                                                 | 2 (0.6%)    |
| All                                                                   | 332         |

Table 6.22

*Desire to pursue further study*

Graduates appear to realise the need for ongoing improvement and updating of their Japan-related skills, and it is to be hoped that Governments and employers will also realise and make provision for on-going training, and that tertiary institutions will provide flexible and appropriate courses to meet the current and future needs in this area.

## 7 SOME INDIVIDUAL ISSUES

### 7.1 Testing in Japanese Language Teaching

#### 7.1.1 Introduction

While Australia has been at the forefront of developments in many areas of Japanese language teaching, the area of testing has not always developed at a similar rate. Outmoded grammatically-focused written tests are still used in many courses where the actual syllabus is much more modern, and test writers are still grappling with such problems as how to test sociolinguistic and sociocultural as well as grammatical competence, how to test spoken as well as written competence and how to bring into testing the kind of authentic and contextualised interaction which is being used in teaching (Neustupný 1990). A lack of appreciation of the importance of testing, as well as scepticism about the validity, reliability and practicality of alternative methods, has caused some teachers and examiners to rely on unsatisfactory but familiar methods from the past. Of course such problems are not limited to Japanese. As Skehan (1988) states, the central problem in all language testing is what and how to sample. Both the underlying applied linguistic theory on the basis of which such decisions must be made and the testing techniques which are used to implement them are still the subject of much debate amongst language testing experts.

The picture is not all negative. Innovations are occurring in testing in a number of courses, both at the secondary and tertiary level. There is a growing awareness that testing is an important issue, not just because of the necessity to make fair and accurate assessments of students for a wide range of purposes, but also because of the 'backwash' effect which testing is said to have on teaching and learning. A variety of newer test types such as role play interaction tests has appeared and individual programs incorporate innovative methods such as self-assessment and testing in situations of authentic interaction with native speakers. There have also been interesting developments in the area of proficiency testing. Yet there is still little general debate about testing within the Japanese teaching profession in Australia.

Owing to the lack of activity by Japanese language experts in this area, much of the impetus and expertise for new developments, particularly in proficiency testing, have come from outside. This is certainly a welcome development in many ways, but as some Japanese language experts have pointed out, unilateral reliance on models developed in the testing of other languages such as English can lead to inappropriate testing programs. This problem arises because of the huge gap between English and Japanese and the differences in communication problems which are encountered by learners of the two languages. In particular, the importance of sociolinguistic and sociocultural rules and strategies has been emphasised in many courses in Japanese but the corresponding components are still missing at the level of testing, because they are not included in many of the models on which new developments are based. There is also the issue of the slower rate of progress which can be expected of an English-speaking learner in Japanese than in a European language, which has particular implications for

proficiency testing (Neustupný 1990). It is clear that a more active input into future developments in Japanese testing in Australia by Japanese language teaching professionals would be highly desirable.

Two areas of testing will be discussed in this chapter: 'achievement' testing, which is usually conducted as a part of a language course and reflects its content and goals; and 'proficiency' testing which measures general ability or skill rather than the product of a particular course of study and is usually conducted externally for the purposes of certification. Achievement assessment of various kinds occurs in almost every language course, both to provide feedback on progress to students and teachers, and for the purpose of grading and certification. Proficiency testing is a relatively new phenomenon in Japanese language education, but one which has major implications, particularly in the area of backwash to courses.

There are areas of overlap between achievement tests and proficiency tests. In general, as the goals of a course become more communicative, and focus on underlying knowledge and skills rather than particular language content, the gap between achievement and proficiency tests can be expected to diminish. In the absence of external proficiency assessment mechanisms, internal course assessment has often been used for purposes such as the determination of competency to use Japanese in occupational settings. Exit level tests for secondary and tertiary courses are particularly subject to this kind of use, although they are not always appropriate for the purpose. On the other hand, there have been suggestions in some quarters (Taylor *et al.* 1992:73) that external proficiency scales would form the ideal basis for curriculum development throughout the education system, and presumably tests based on these scales would to a great extent replace achievement testing for all external purposes. This approach holds a number of dangers.

The areas of overlap between achievement and proficiency testing highlight one of the central issues in test validity - the way in which the test is interpreted and used. As Bachman (1990) states, it is these issues, rather than the content or scores in isolation which must be examined in determining the validity of a test. Unfortunately, this fact is often forgotten by both examiners and members of the community needing to interpret test results. The Japanese teaching profession has a responsibility to ensure that the right test is chosen for the intended purpose, and conversely, that tests designed for one purpose are not inappropriately used for other purposes.

### 7.1.2 'Achievement' testing: the tertiary level

The fact that academic grades are used by employers and others as the source of information about the competence of Japanese speakers has focused attention, often critical, on what these grades actually mean, what is taught in the courses concerned and what is tested. The truth is that the content of courses varies between institutions, and as testing typically reflects the content of courses, the meaning of grades obtained in courses which ostensibly are of the same level (eg, final year high school) needs careful consideration.

A limited survey of testing in Japanese at third year university levels across Australia was conducted in order to throw light on a number of issues. How accurately does the testing reflect what is being taught? What are the most common testing methods used, and how sophisticated are they? To what extent could the course grades be expected to give an indication of proficiency in Japanese, in addition to achievement in a particular course?

The third year was chosen because this is the final year for the majority of students, and the results which they achieve are likely to be used not just for academic purposes but by the outside community for the evaluation of their Japanese competence. All tertiary departments which could be identified as teaching Japanese to at least third year level were requested to provide information about course content and assessment as well as samples of tests. Questionnaires were sent to 22 institutions and responses were received from 18 of them. Of the four institutions which failed to respond, we were unable to confirm in one case whether or not a third year program existed.

### 1. General level and content of the courses

Although the main focus was on testing, the survey also sought background information on the content and level of third year tertiary courses. Institutions, and often individual staff members within institutions, possess great autonomy in determining course content; it is therefore interesting to note the areas of similarity as well as the diversity between courses.

Institutions were asked to submit details for all third year level courses which they offered. It was anticipated that some institutions would offer courses at different third year levels, reflecting beginners' and advanced streams within their programs. This is because of the two major types of students catered for by tertiary institutions: those who start as beginners (the majority of students) and those who enter university having completed a high-school Year 12 course in Japanese or having some other exposure to the language (such as a high-school exchange). Some institutions stream such students throughout their courses, while others base their courses on students without background, allowing other students to complete a major in a shorter time, or giving them some extra work in addition to the basic course. (See Section 2.4 for further details.) One would therefore expect that in addition to third year programs for students who had commenced their studies at university there would be programs at a higher level for advanced third year students.

Unfortunately it was often difficult to determine from the information provided at which of these two levels courses were offered. In most cases, information on courses for only one level was provided, sometimes consisting of a number of smaller sub-units or alternative options. The standard of the courses varied from one which described itself as low-intermediate to a number of courses which claimed to be at a fairly advanced level. While some courses were based almost entirely on text-books, a number made extensive use of authentic Japanese texts such as novels, newspapers and non-fiction. A number of courses made reference to the study of between 200 and 250 characters per semester. Extrapolating from this, it would seem that the students were likely to have studied a total of between 1,200 to 1,500 characters by the end of their three year course. Other courses specifically stated that students were expected to be familiar with all

the 1,945 *joyo* (common use) characters, or at least be able to read materials containing them with some reference to dictionaries.

With regard to oral/aural skills, there was also a range of targets, extending from conducting fairly basic conversation on everyday topics to listening to radio and television broadcasts, the use of a wide range of registers and the discussion and presentation of opinions on complex intellectual issues.

In terms of paradigms of language teaching, the grammar-translation, audio-lingual and post-audio-lingual paradigms were all represented. Some courses were basically reading courses, sometimes with oral discussion of the texts studied. Others were grammatically based, with both written and oral materials being related to the core grammatical syllabus. There were also several post-audiolingual courses, focusing on oral communication skills as well as the ability to read a variety of Japanese texts.

## 2. Assessment

All courses used a number of different assessment components, typically employing a combination of continuous and end-of-semester assessment. Most institutions included some kind of written examination or examinations, an aural examination and an oral examination. Other forms of assessment included homework exercises, major research projects or essays, and class performance, participation or attendance. Less commonly used components were self-assessment (used at two institutions), and assessment by a native speaker conversational partner who was not a teacher (one institution).

In the written examinations, common components were reading comprehension exercises (using seen or unseen texts), tests of characters, items requiring grammatical manipulation, composition questions and translations. While most institutions included a range of question types, a number of the examinations were quite narrow, relying wholly on translation in two cases. In another case, questions focused almost entirely on the sentence level, with little requirement for the comprehension or production of extended passages.

A distinction could be made between examinations which appeared to test rote learning of material covered in the course (eg, memorisation of characters, comprehension of extracts from texts which had been studied, grammatical manipulation in sentences similar to ones presented in the course) and examinations which appeared to test acquired competence in ways that did not lend themselves to the application of rote-learned knowledge. However, it was not always clear to which category a given item belonged (eg, whether a comprehension passage was seen or unseen) and this made judgements of the relative difficulty of material hard. There were indications, however, that in some courses the emphasis on rote learning was very strong. While this is not necessarily undesirable in all cases, it is an issue which deserves careful attention, especially in the consideration of the usefulness of university grades as an indication of proficiency, which is discussed below. It would be worthwhile to investigate whether an over-reliance on rote learning arises from particular educational and testing philosophies, or whether it is primarily a function of the difficulty of material covered in some courses.



The majority of courses included some kind of aural examination. These typically consisted of comprehension questions on taped dialogues or monologues, passages from written texts, or radio or television broadcasts. A small number used video rather than audio tape (either from television or other sources) and there was one dictation test.

Oral tests were conducted at all 18 institutions (although not in all courses because some institutions offered reading courses, often in conjunction with separate courses focusing on spoken interaction). The combined oral/aural components were typically between 15% and 45% of the overall weighting for the assessment. The most common type of oral examination consisted of an interview with an examiner about topics covered in the course, but there was considerable variety. Other formats included conversation in pairs, discussion in small groups, role plays and presentation of a monologue, oral report or speech. Assessment items at two institutions involved conversation with a non-teacher native speaker, assessed in one case by the native speakers themselves in combination with self-assessment, and in the other, by an examiner from a tape. Tests of oral proficiency are one of the more controversial areas in language testing, with debate currently occurring regarding the merits of the popular oral proficiency interview format (OPI) as well as alternative formats such as performance tests (Skehan 1988, Shohamy 1992). It is encouraging to see that several courses are experimenting with innovative modes of testing in this area, and it is to be hoped that these experiments will be followed up with proper evaluation of the validity, reliability and backwash of the tests. In this way we will ensure that our efforts will be able to feed into as well as draw from the wider developments in the testing of oral proficiency in the future.

One observation may be made about the content and methodology of oral as opposed to written examinations. In contrast to the extensive use of translation in written examinations (ten institutions), no oral examinations involved interpreting. According to the survey results reported in Section 6.4.1 (Table 6.19), 26% of graduates who used their Japanese in their employment claimed to have done some interpreting within the last month. There is no doubt that professional interpreting is a highly specialised skill which cannot be taught in a general undergraduate course. However, it may be that the kind of informal interpreting which occurs in many occupations would be a legitimate skill for inclusion in teaching and assessment at the tertiary level. On the other hand, the lack of attention to interpreting implies that much of the translation which is found in written testing is not testing translating skills as such, but is used as a means to test comprehension and production skills in courses designed under the grammar-translation paradigm. Perhaps a review of the role and purpose of translation in teaching and testing would also be desirable.

In general, it can be said that the tests were overall fairly traditional in construction and content, with some notable exceptions. Most of the tests appeared to be well-constructed within the constraints of the particular test type, but a few exhibited obvious deficiencies. It seems that modern developments in language testing have been slow to reach some of our language departments, and that there is room for further development in this area.

A key question in the examination of university assessment, particularly in the light of reservations in some quarters about the usefulness of university grades for



proficiency assessments by employers and others, is: what do they actually tell us about proficiency, and what should we expect them to tell us? Can judgements formed in the process of assessing achievement in a particular course give information about proficiency and if so, what kind of proficiency? This question is particularly relevant at present, given the proliferation of courses, the needs of employers and the debate about the need for external proficiency testing.

Respondents from half of the institutions surveyed (nine) claimed that the assessment for their courses was basically achievement-oriented, ie, testing mastery of material presented in the particular course of study. Respondents from only one institution considered that they primarily assessed proficiency, that is, general skills in Japanese not tied to the content covered in a specific course. The remainder of the institutions reported that the assessment had elements of both achievement and proficiency testing, although the former was generally considered to be stronger. This result is not surprising, for after all the assessment was designed to provide certification related to a specific course. It would be unfair to students if the assessment instruments did not reflect achievement in that course. On the other hand, those who considered that their assessment also had elements of proficiency testing were perhaps mindful of the fact that language learning is cumulative, and that assessment at this level is widely used by the outside world as a measure of proficiency. They may also have believed that their courses were aiming to develop overall proficiency and that this was therefore a legitimate focus for assessment. Bachman (1990) maintains that central to the notion of proficiency testing is a theoretical model for the components of that proficiency. Those courses that aim to develop (and test) underlying competencies, as opposed to the mastery of a particular body of linguistic content, are likely to have achievement assessments which also reflect more general proficiency.

The degree to which the tests examined for this study appeared to measure proficiency varied, although only general comments can be made because detailed information about course content was not available. Those which probably least reflected proficiency were those tied to specific texts covered in the course (either oral or written). These tests may use such texts verbatim, eg, in reading comprehension questions, or give other types of questions which can be answered on the basis of rote-learned language, such as 'prove that you understand the following patterns by using them in sentences' (found in two of the tests) or test oral proficiency solely on the basis of rehearsed conversations. This leads to an encouragement of rote learning and do not test students' ability to generalise or use creatively what they have learnt.

On the other hand, even where testing seemed to attempt to assess underlying skills and knowledge rather than particular language components, the focus on particular types of skills and knowledge varied from course to course, and the testing naturally reflected this. While this is an issue which must be taken into consideration in the use of grades for external purposes, it does not necessarily make them less useful than the results from a standard proficiency test. It can be argued that the one magical proficiency score which some members of the community seem to desire - a score which will give a fair assessment of the relative abilities of graduates from widely differing courses and which will be equally useful and relevant to an education department selecting new teachers, a duty-free shop owner wishing to employ a Japanese speaking salesperson and a

university screening applicants for a postgraduate course - is impossible to achieve. Therefore an achievement score, or set of scores, used judiciously on the basis of knowledge about the content of the course and of the assessment might often prove to be a more realistic tool. It is more likely to be treated with caution by users in the community as an indication of proficiency within the context of a specific course. If the course and assessment are well constructed it may even be preferable to a proficiency score, which will similarly reflect the limitations of the test parameters, and from which the public is more likely to have unrealistic expectations.

Several other issues relate to this question of the meaning and usefulness of course assessments as indications of proficiency. One is the issue of Japanese for Special Purposes (JSP), which is discussed elsewhere in this report. Most of the courses and testing analysed for this discussion were general in nature, although there were a few exceptions. However, there are indications that the number of JSP courses will grow. In such cases, it is more likely that course objectives will be based on proficiency within a given context. Hence it could be expected that achievement tests in these courses would give a more accurate indication of proficiency within the target area of competence than would achievement tests for a general course. On the other hand, the generalisability of results to other areas could not be expected to be as high.

Another issue involves the standards used for assessment. It is common to distinguish between criterion-based assessment (which measures performance on the basis of specific objective criteria) and norm-based assessment (where students are measured against their peers rather than by any objective standards). This issue was not specifically examined in the present brief survey, but it is probable that most courses use some kind of combination. Course co-ordinators usually have certain objectives and standards in mind, but they are also influenced by expected or accepted distributions of results (be they normal or otherwise), from which, for all sorts of reasons, it is considered undesirable to deviate. This means that there is a real problem in comparing the marks of students from different institutions, because the standards of students and courses are unlikely to be consistent. Thus, even if course and assessment content were to be identical, the standards required for a given grade would be likely to vary.

This is a fact which is often used in calls for external proficiency assessments. However, while such assessments may appear to be fair in that they purport to assess all students on the same criteria, there is considerable debate in language testing circles about various aspects which impinge on their validity and therefore their 'fairness'.

One way of increasing the credibility and usefulness of internal assessments for external use is to give clear statements of course content and assessment criteria and a breakdown of results in different areas of the course if this is appropriate, instead of the traditional single grade or mark. This would potentially give a fuller picture of what skills the examinee does and does not possess. It can be argued that the interpretation of such results would require more sophistication than many end-users currently possess, but on the positive side, it might serve to alert some of them to the dangers of placing blind faith in a single score without determining how it was arrived at or its relevance to their particular needs. It would also force institutions to define and make public the target competencies

which they are assessing. Although we are unlikely to see institutions willing to state, for example, 'this student has achieved a mark of 80% in a test involving the rote learning of passages from the textbook and the ability to recognise 500 characters', the very act of having to spell out exactly what it is they believe they are teaching and assessing might force some institutions to give these issues more serious consideration. Assessment reporting at Year 12 in some States is currently being revised to provide more detailed information about the meaning of grades, and it is not unreasonable to expect that the universities should do likewise if they wish to increase the usefulness of their assessments.

### 7.1.3 Testing at the Year 12 level

Testing at Year 12 level in the various States and Territories was also examined. This level was chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly, testing at this level is regulated by an external body in all States, tests are carefully prepared and therefore likely to represent 'the state of the art' fairly accurately, and they are published and relatively accessible. Secondly, it is an extremely important level for a number of reasons. Whereas assessment at other secondary levels is often not a very serious matter, Year 12 assessments are used as the basis for tertiary selection, and thus the results of testing have far-reaching effects on the lives of those who undergo it. Because of their importance, the tests have a very significant 'backwash' effect on teaching, not only at the Year 12 level, but also at lower levels. They also exert influence in an upwards direction, because tertiary institutions may use the content covered in the tests as a starting point for designing their own first-year courses for students entering from the secondary system.

Tests and/or syllabuses with descriptions of assessment were obtained for NSW (1992), Queensland (1991), South Australia (1991), Tasmania (1991), Victoria (1992) and Western Australia (1991). Most States appear to have either recently rewritten or be currently rewriting their Year 12 courses so that some of the details given below may no longer be current.

There is considerable variation in approach between the States. Most courses claim that the target of the course is 'communicative competence' (usually along with a list of other less concrete aims, such as increased empathy and heightened awareness of the students' own language, which are not subsequently referred to again). However, some focus fairly narrowly on linguistic skills, while others encompass the teaching and testing of a broader range of communicative skills. The syllabus materials typically spell out the grammatical patterns to be mastered, usually classified in terms of language functions, as well as the topics and in some cases situations to be covered. They also prescribe characters, either as a set number which must be covered, or as a wider list from which course providers may choose. Most also prescribe some kind of sociocultural knowledge or awareness, often integrated with the topics prescribed for language use, but this is rarely explicitly tested.

All States use a combination of internal (usually moderated) and external assessment, and some have more than one syllabus and set of assessment instruments for the Year 12 level.

**New South Wales** has three courses. The first consists of a basic '2/3-unit' syllabus with a more advanced 3-unit extension for those students who wish to extend their knowledge, particularly in the area of reading/writing skills. This extension uses authentic material (ie, material published for the Japanese market) as a text. Within the 2/3-unit basic course there is the requirement to study one of three options: Literature, Japanese for Tourism or Film. Literature and film options were also available in the Victorian course until several years ago (along with an option on Japanese writing) but the tourism option is of particular interest because it is one of the few instances (along with some short courses in Tasmania) of Japanese for Special Purposes at the secondary level. Some other States have syllabuses which are flexible enough to include such an optional course element, but do not include it as part of a prescribed syllabus.

The second course is a 2-unit 'Z course', which is the final year of an accelerated course for those without previous knowledge of Japanese conducted over the final two years of schooling. There is also a third course, focusing on Japanese literature, available for native speakers of Japanese. This latter course appears to be unique amongst the States, and provides one model for the accommodation of native speakers within the education system. This problem remains unresolved in the other States, and will be further discussed below.

External assessment in the first two courses includes reading comprehension, transliteration, translation into Japanese and composition, aural comprehension, reading aloud, and conversation. The latter is in the form of questions (worded in a set format) from an examiner for the 2/3 unit, and in the Z unit, what appears to be a taped test of speaking skills elicited by written English cues. This last examination is noteworthy in that the cues are apparently for conversational interaction, and yet the student must deliver a monologue or one-sided dialogue into a tape rather than interacting with a conversational partner. NSW and Queensland are the only States which include no oral interaction in their assessment, an omission which must be regarded as significant, particularly in terms of its backwash effect.

The **Queensland** examination is amongst the more innovative of the State examinations. It comprises written, listening and (taped) speaking tests. The written paper includes reading comprehension and composition questions, but unlike those in some other States, these are framed as communicative tasks. Examples include a summary of a passage in English for a particular audience, and an analysis of an advertisement written for an employer, which requires candidates to identify factual information, persuasive information and information with a negative impact. In the 1990 examination (although not as consistently in 1991) a clear situation and purpose for each task is identified, as are additional participants (eg, the audience for a piece of writing). The listening test is also framed in the form of communicative tasks. The criteria for assessment include such elements as 'distinguishing main points from subsidiary points', and 'comprehension of style / register / abstractions / subtleties / tone / intention'. Furthermore, the questions are framed in a way that tests these points. This is a much more sophisticated approach, with a wider view of receptive skills to be tested, than is seen in most of the other listening comprehension tests. The 'speaking test' is in the form of a taped monologue produced by the student in response to written or visual stimulus material. It

resembles the format used in NSW, although is less unnatural because it does not require the student to imagine and react to responses from a non-existent conversational partner, as appears to happen at times in the NSW examination.

It is significant that the two largest States in terms of student numbers (Queensland and NSW) employ taped oral tests rather than tests involving interaction with examiners. As numbers increase and the logistics of live testing, training of examiners and moderation procedures becomes more complicated, it is possible that other States may consider adopting such procedures. While there is some evidence that well-designed tape-based tests may be just as valid as standard oral interview procedures (Shohamy 1992) this may be more of a reflection of the limitations of the interview-based tests than an indication of the validity of tape-based tests. There are many aspects of communication such as non-verbal communication and negotiation of meaning which cannot be captured in a tape-based test. These dimensions are not always assessed in tests involving live interaction either, but a greater potential exists for this to occur. Informal reports also indicate that the backwash from tape-based procedures is not as desirable as from live interaction-based tests. On the other hand, there is also informal evidence that the conduct of oral tests in some States involves serious problems in areas such as the training of examiners, which research has shown to be crucial to their reliability. In situations such as Year 12 assessment, which is used as a basis for important decisions affecting students' future lives, the reliability of tests is critical. It may be that tape-based tests would offer greater reliability than live interviews. In any case, a thorough examination of the validity and relative merits of the alternative types of oral testing at this level is long overdue, and we recommend that the authorities concerned in the various States co-operate in initiating such a project.

**Tasmania** has a four-stage syllabus, which can be commenced in early secondary school or in Year 11, in a more intensive mode of study. For students commencing studies in Year 8 and completing Stage 4 in Year 9, a 50-hour course called Advanced Japanese is available as an extra during Year 12. The external assessment is based on a ten-minute conversation with an examiner on familiar topics, and a two-hour written examination covering reading comprehension, translation into Japanese and the composition of a short dialogue. The external testing is thus fairly traditional in format, especially in its inclusion of a translation as a test of composition skills. Short 50-hour courses in specialised areas which have been accepted by the schools board are also offered in some schools; however assessment details were not available. Examples of these short courses include 'Japanese Studies', 'Japanese for Hospitality' and 'Grammar for Students of LOTE' (JLTAV 1992).

The syllabus in **Western Australia** is one of the more traditional in appearance, and the rather dated resource list (most of the texts date from the 1970s and the most recent was published in 1983) suggests that it has remained unchanged for some time. The examination is fairly traditional, including reading comprehension, grammar and characters (one of the few States that still tests grammar in a discrete item format), composition, aural comprehension test and a 15-minute interview on prescribed topics.

The assessment in **South Australia** is similar in nature to that of Western Australia, and is currently under revision. It includes reading comprehension,



characters, grammatical operations, composition and a cultural background essay to be written in English. This examination provides one of the few examples of explicit inclusion of culture in assessment. There is also an aural examination and a general conversation interview, which includes a response to a visual stimulus (description of, or other response to a picture).

The syllabus in Victoria changed in 1992 from the previous 'situational syllabus', which attempted to cover linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence in a situational context, to a syllabus common to all LOTE in the State, assessed on a series of 'work requirements' and 'common assessment tasks'. The first of the external components of assessment is very similar to that in the old syllabus, which was developed to approximate a real communicative situation as closely as possible. It takes the form of an oral interview. This includes a more traditional conversation with examiners and a discussion of a nominated topic. It also involves a role play. The students play themselves, and must interact with an examiner playing a specified role on the basis of a set of instructions outlining a situation and task, such as giving directions to a Japanese tourist using a map provided. It is interesting that although role play is mentioned as a teaching activity in several of the syllabuses from other States, it has not been used as a testing procedure. The second external examination is entitled 'Discourse Reorganisation', and involves a writing task to be completed on the basis of a variety of written and aural source materials. This item, which requires the use of reading and aural comprehension as well as written production skills in the accomplishment of one task, shows a radical departure from the approaches in the other States which clearly separate the four macro skills.

Overall, the picture at the Year 12 level is of fairly traditional testing, following a common pattern in most States, with more innovative test formats having been developed in Queensland and Victoria. The standard and type of language required, and the situations and topics prescribed, show a high degree of commonality, although there are small differences in the range of grammar, number of characters, inclusion of a variety of registers and other areas. Sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence are included in some syllabuses but are only tested in a minority of cases. As has been stated elsewhere, this report takes the view that true Japan-literacy must include these areas, and this is therefore an area where further work is required.

In terms of comparability, the similarity in content, along with the large and presumably relatively similar populations undertaking Year 12 tests, would indicate that Year 12 results from different States would be more comparable than would tertiary results. This is not to under-estimate the differences which could be expected to result from variation in testing content and method. The issue of just what it is that the newer types of tests are measuring, and to what extent this overlaps with what is being measured in the more traditional test types, is one which merits empirical investigation. In fact, given the importance both in terms of backwash and of the effect of results on students' future lives, the whole area of Year 12 testing is one which deserves greater attention from language testing professionals and teachers alike. It is arguable that if resources are to be devoted to the development of testing at the high school level, the most crucial need and the most effective use of resources would be in the improvement of existing Year 12 level testing, rather than in other areas such as the development of 'proficiency' tests. This would require co-operation between the

States, which is never easy to achieve. However, the aim would not necessarily be to standardise testing, but rather to raise consciousness amongst teachers and testing authorities and to conduct research on which testing authorities could draw, in order to improve their testing in ways which met their local needs.

One final point should be made in regard to Year 12 testing, and that is the importance of developing procedures to cater for students with differing levels of competence, such as those undertaking an intensive two-year course in the senior secondary years, returned exchange students and native speakers. Although specific data were not collected on a nation-wide basis for this report, it is common knowledge that the presence in language courses of advantaged candidates has been a serious problem. Due to the standardisation procedures carried out in many States, such candidates often monopolised the top grade levels, making it difficult for non-advantaged students to achieve high marks. This discouraged brighter, more ambitious students from taking the language due to the negative impact their scores would have on their prospects for selection into highly competitive tertiary courses. Acceptable arrangements for avoiding this problem have been negotiated over the years in individual States, either by recognising variations from a normal distribution of results, or by the provision of separate courses. However this is an area which requires constant monitoring and co-operation from testing authorities. In most States there remains much scope for improvement, both in terms of allowing advantaged students to pursue courses which will capitalise on their skills, and in ensuring that non-advantaged students are treated fairly.

#### 7.1.4 External 'proficiency' testing

As noted above, in recent years there has been a flurry of interest in the area of Japanese language certification and proficiency testing for use by employers, educational institutions and others. In Australia this seems to have been more intense in the case of Japanese than for other foreign languages. This probably reflects the greater practical need for Japanese language skills and for independent ways of assessing them in certain sectors of society, in conjunction with the greater availability of Government funds for their development.

The first developments in this area occurred in Japan, where the Ministry of Education designed tests for scholarship applicants. These are still being used. A more recent and ambitious attempt at proficiency testing is the 'Japanese Language Proficiency Test', administered by the Japan Foundation and the Association of International Education, Japan (Japan Foundation 1989). This test was first introduced in 1984 and is now administered annually in a number of foreign countries as well as in Japan (22 countries in 1989). The test is available at four levels, and comprises written and listening comprehension papers. It does not test proficiency in speaking at all. In Japan the test is used to screen candidates for entry to Japanese tertiary institutions as well as for general certification. Due to the reluctance of some Australian tertiary institutions to accept the test, the number of candidates varies considerably from State to State. Concern has been expressed in Australia and elsewhere about the narrowly linguistic focus of the test as well as its concentration on the written language. This has been combined with a concern about its potentially negative backwash



on courses which have a different focus, particularly given the potential for its use by Japanese authorities for the purpose of ranking institutions as well as individuals. The test is most popular in NSW, where its influence is such that a number of courses have been established to train candidates in passing the test.

In addition to the developments in Japan, Japanese language versions of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines were developed, and tests based on these scales were devised but have not been widely used in Australia. Those who have used the tests indicate that whilst they fill a serious gap in the Japanese testing repertoire there are many aspects which require improvement (Makino 1991).

In Australia, the expansion in demand for Japanese speakers in various sectors created an interest by various official bodies in the establishment of Japanese proficiency tests. This interest was based on the perception that academic qualifications are often difficult to use in determining general or occupationally-related proficiency and that independent tests were needed. In addition to the expected demand from employers, there was probably also a desire to have an independent check on the quality of the proliferating number of Japanese courses. In 1990 a group of experts in language testing from both Australia and overseas, a smaller number of Japanese language educators who had an interest in the area and representatives from industry and other bodies were invited by the Asian Studies Council to present proposals for proficiency testing in a number of areas relating to Japanese. Only one of these proposals, a set of tests for the hospitality industry, has been fully implemented to date. These tests have been developed by the NLLIA Language Testing Centre at the University of Melbourne with funding from the Victorian Education Foundation (VEF) and with the co-operation of the Department of Japanese Studies at Monash University. There are two general hospitality industry tests, one for beginners and one for intermediate students. They are both language laboratory-based tests in speaking and aural comprehension. A separate test for tour guides has also been developed which uses an interactive interview involving role-play. A feature of the test development has been the close involvement of industry specialists in the specifications for the tests (Taylor *et al.* 1992; Brown 1993; Pinkerton and Brown 1993).

Testing of the proficiency of language teachers and prospective language teachers is another area where developments are taking place. These developments are not confined to Japanese but stem from initiatives in several States to assess the language competence of teachers. The NLLIA language testing centre at Melbourne University has developed instruments in Italian to assess the competence of applicants to Diploma in Education programs as well as of pre-service language teachers and it is possible that this work could act as a model for testing in other languages. In addition, several State education systems are starting to design or implement their own tests. These developments have important implications for the future of the teaching profession. On the one hand, if properly implemented, they will address some of the concerns about teacher quality. On the other hand, there is concern amongst teachers and testing specialists alike that important 'gate-keeping' examinations of this nature which have serious implications for both the lives of individuals and for the education system may be implemented without adequate consultation and validation. There are indications that in some areas tests have been developed

hastily without proper validation and that unnecessarily and unrealistically high standards are being imposed. (The issue of unrealistic expectations for the competence of Japanese teachers has been discussed in Chapter 4.) This results in a situation where teachers already in the system are allowed to teach with minimal levels of competence, while new entrants with considerably higher levels are being excluded. The issues of who should have input into decisions about such testing programs, what should be tested, how it should be tested, and what use should be made of the results, are important ones for the Japanese teaching community and deserve more widespread debate.

In the area of general proficiency testing, the NLLIA Language Testing Centres at Griffith University and the University of Melbourne are working on the development of Japanese proficiency scales and tests for which they have obtained initial funding from the Government. The project includes three components: the development of a generic scale as the basis for proficiency assessment in Japanese; the development of tests, including interview-based and pencil and paper tests relating to the generic scale as well as specific purpose tests; and the development of proficiency scales for use in the school context 'to provide an overarching framework within which curricula can be rationally and coherently developed and to provide a basis on which to develop instruments to assess school learners' (Taylor *et al.* 1992:68-69).

As stated previously, such a project is likely to have enormous implications for the teaching of Japanese at the secondary and tertiary level, because of the 'backwash' on courses. That is, if such tests gain wide acceptance, courses will have to adapt to teach to the test. If the tests are well designed, some of this backwash may be positive; it is clear that those involved believe that it will be. However it is almost inevitable that there will also be some negative effects. Given the likely wide influence of the tests, it is disappointing that to date there does not appear yet to have been much consultation with and discussion amongst the Japanese teaching community about just what should be included as criteria for proficiency at each level. We believe that such involvement is essential, and hope that this issue receives the wide debate that it deserves.

Even with such input from the Japanese teaching profession, it is unlikely that all of the components which are considered desirable will be able to be included in general scales or tests. As is the case with intelligence tests, the definition of 'proficiency' will become that which is tested in the proficiency test. Courses which have specialised or innovative approaches which develop other aspects of proficiency are likely to face pressure to conform to the standard model. This is already the case with other proficiency tests, such as that administered by the Japan Foundation. No matter how well designed the tests may be, it is inevitable that they will have the effect of limiting the diversity of courses currently on offer, or which may be developed in the future. For those who believe that such diversity is one of the strengths of our education system, the proposed introduction of general proficiency tests has been met with some misgivings. It is possible that the tests will stall the further innovative development of teaching and testing occurring in many centres. Unfortunately, this issue seems to have received scant attention from either the proponents of standardised proficiency testing or from the Japanese teaching profession.

Another problem with the development and widespread use of proficiency tests is the differing levels of proficiency attained by learners of Japanese when compared with learners of European languages over a similar period of time. This problem is particularly acute with proficiency measurements expressed in terms of proficiency scales, such as the Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating (ASLPR). The majority of learners of Japanese at the high school and early tertiary level would fall within the first band of commonly used English language scales. In order to be meaningful, much finer distinctions would have to be made in the lower bands of the scales, and it is not clear whether or not this is feasible. With lower levels of proficiency, the influence of specific courses of study is likely to be more pronounced, and there is a real question as to whether true 'proficiency' as opposed to 'achievement' measures can be constructed.

A full awareness of the dangers and limitations as well as the possible advantages of proficiency testing should inform the debate on the issue, and measures should be taken to ensure that any negative backwash is closely monitored and minimised as far as possible.

The recent activity in proficiency testing has arisen against a background of general trends in education and testing such as the competency movement and in response to real problems in the certification of language proficiency. However it is clear that it may bring with it a new set of problems and will not necessarily solve the original problems as easily as some of its proponents seem to expect, especially in the area of general proficiency testing. Other approaches to improving the information available to employers and others need also to be addressed. As indicated previously, the problems in the secondary area may be better addressed by greater attention to existing assessment, such as Year 12 assessment. At all levels the usefulness of achievement scores could be improved by providing end users with more information about what the scores actually mean and by improving the standards of testing used.

## 7.2 Support for Japanese Language Teaching

### 7.2.1 National projects

The Asian Studies Council during its period of existence (1986 to mid-1991) was responsible for planning and implementing a number of initiatives in the area of Asian languages and Asian studies. Some of this work involving the implementation of the different programs has been continued by DEET and in particular by the NLLIA. As noted in the Asian Studies Council's 1991 report, funding was granted for such specific Japanese projects as:

National Japanese Curriculum Project  
Japanese Teacher Trainers Scholarships  
Japanese Research Methodology  
Proficiency Levels Conference.

The NLLIA is currently conducting or considering the following projects related to Japanese, through its various centres:

Japanese Proficiency Rating Scale (Language Testing and Curriculum Centre, Griffith University)

Development of a test instrument to assess the proficiency of Japanese teachers (Language Testing Centre, University of Melbourne)

Comparative study of Japanese and Australian systems of management and training (Centre for Workplace Communication and Culture, University of Technology, Sydney)

The National Japanese Curriculum Project is discussed below, while the Proficiency Levels conference and the projects which developed from it have been discussed in Section 7.1 above.

### 7.2.2 New curriculum development

One feature which characterises Japanese as well as other subjects at the secondary level throughout Australia is the separateness of State curricula. All States have devoted considerable effort to curriculum and course development over the past few years, often with little knowledge of what was being done elsewhere. The development of the Australian Language Levels (ALL) Guidelines provided a national reference point which has been used in a number of States. However, for the most part, development has been completely independent. This has had advantages in allowing the development of syllabuses which cater for local needs and in encouraging diversity and innovation rather than conformity but has also resulted in inefficient use of scant resources and a lack of transferability for students who move interstate.

In response to this situation, the Japanese Curriculum Project was established to develop curriculum guidelines which would be appropriate for use throughout Australia. The project, part of a wider project involving other languages, was federally funded and was undertaken jointly by the Queensland Department of Education and the Western Australian Ministry of Education, with input from all States and the Northern Territory in the form of a National Reference Group. The resulting product, which is informed by the ALL guidelines, is the Japanese Curriculum Guidelines (*Yoroshiku*), which will be published by the Curriculum Corporation in 1993. It consists of curriculum guidelines for three integrated stages covering levels K-12 and is supported by teaching and learning resources. The curriculum features the possibility of entry at different points and claims to have the flexibility to cater for a range of programs. However, it remains to be seen how widely it will be adopted outside the States in which it originated.

Even if the *Yoroshiku* materials are widely used, they do not constitute a fully developed course, and there remains much work to be done in course design both at State level and at the level of individual schools.

At the secondary level, courses have historically been shaped from the top downwards, due to the fact that exit level courses for Year 12 (and in some cases Year 11) have been subject to external prescriptions and examinations. Although the amount of external assessment has been reduced over recent years in most

States, and in many cases courses have been made more flexible, the influence of the Year 11 and 12 courses on the curricula throughout the secondary years will remain strong. Another factor influencing courses has been the content of textbooks and this will no doubt continue to be the case, although there is now a wider variety of material available than ever before.

At the primary level courses are less well developed and appropriate materials are even more scarce, as mentioned in Chapter 2. In addition, there is an even greater diversity of approaches and targets for competence than in the secondary sector. Although small in number, bilingual programs exist in a number of States, and in 1993 a Bachelor of Teaching course has been established at the University of Central Queensland, Rockhampton campus, to train primary teachers in the bilingual mode. The course itself will use bilingual methods and will prepare teachers to do so in their own teaching. At the other end of the spectrum, many courses receive only very short time allotments and do not aim for high levels of linguistic competence.

### 7.2.3 Professional support at the State level

The degree of support available to teachers varies considerably throughout the country. Queensland appears to have one of the most extensive programs, including the appointment of four Japanese advisory teachers located throughout the State (including one funded with support from the Japan Foundation) as well as the provision of a range of in-service programs. New South Wales has two advisers, one a native speaker of Japanese appointed with financial support from the Japan Foundation and the other an Australian teacher. This combination appears to work well and could be used as a model by other States. At the lower end of the scale, several States (including Victoria, despite its relatively high number of enrolments) do not have a single Japanese expert employed in a support, curriculum development or advisory position. States without Japanese advisers suffer doubly: they are often unable to take maximum advantage of support provided by external bodies such as the Japan Foundation because there is no-one to write submissions or administer programs.

State systems also seem to differ in the degree to which education ministry staff are involved with schools outside the Government system, both in providing access to services to individual schools and teachers and in co-ordinating with the Independent and Catholic systems on issues of mutual interest. These systems also vary from State to State in the degree to which they provide their own support services. Obviously, a co-operative support system which provides maximum coverage with minimum duplication of resources is in the best interests of all concerned, but this is often difficult to achieve.

All schools and teachers stand to gain much from the services of specialist language advisers for minimal cost. Given the fact that a large number of teachers are relatively new to the profession, such support is particularly vital in maintaining and upgrading the quality of programs in Japanese. The practices of Queensland and NSW deserve replication elsewhere and we strongly recommend the establishment of such posts in all States.



#### 7.2.4 Professional associations

Although Japanese was a relatively small subject in the 1970s and even in the 1980s, it developed a strong base throughout Australia. Most States have a separate State association under the name of Japanese Language Teachers' Association, though in several States the Japanese group is a part of the Modern Language Teachers' Association of that State. These State organisations, which are run on a voluntary basis, play an important role in providing a means of self-support for teachers, organising in-service training and combined activities for students and, in some States, preparing and distributing newsletters. They have been very influential in the development of Japanese language studies in Australia, particularly in the early years when external support for Japanese was low. They still play a vital role, particularly in the States where few other forms of professional support exist.

However, in a political sense, the associations have not always been able to keep up with the huge growth in Japanese in recent years and have sometimes been ignored in the enormous changes which have ensued. Recently, some organisations have realised that structures and services which were appropriate in the days when Japanese was a minor subject and the number of teachers was small no longer meet the demands of their members. Several associations are in the process of upgrading their services and profiles to meet these challenges, although this is not an easy task for organisations with limited resources run on a voluntary basis by busy teachers.

There have also been calls (expressed, among other places, at a conference of State representatives organised by the Japan Foundation in 1992) for closer links between the State associations, and perhaps for a national umbrella organisation. At a time when Japanese is in many ways at the crossroads, input from strong professional associations of Japanese teachers will be essential in ensuring the health of the profession and of Japanese language education in this country.

#### 7.2.5 Other organisational support: the Japan Foundation

The Japan Foundation has long supported the teaching of Japanese overseas in various ways. Programs such as library support, materials donation and inviting overseas teachers to training programs in Japan have been of great value to teachers at all levels. The establishment of a language centre in Urawa, North of Tokyo, has led to an expansion of training programs in Japan, of both a short-term and long-term nature, from which numerous Australian teachers of Japanese have benefited.

In 1991 the Japan Foundation established its Sydney Language Centre which performs a number of functions specifically focused upon the secondary level. Among these is a library lending service, including videos, assistance in various forms in the training of Japanese language teachers, the publication of a regular newsletter for Japanese language teachers called *Dear Sensei*, and some financial assistance for Japanese language related education and training. In 1992 its staff consisted of the Director and three language advisers. The support from the



Japan Foundation for Japanese language teaching in Australia is thus considerable.

In recent years the Australia Japan Foundation has also supported the spread of Japanese in Australian secondary schools through funding teacher training initiatives, summer refresher courses for teachers and in-service workshops for teachers.

---

#### **7.2.6 National Forum on Japanese Language Teacher Education**

In September 1992 a forum on Japanese Teacher Education was held at the University of Queensland under the auspices of the Key Centre for Asian Languages and Studies. It attracted a large number of participants from throughout the country, far in excess of the initial expectations of the organisers, and provided an opportunity for discussion of many issues relevant to Japanese language education in general as well as of teacher education specifically.

---

### **7.3 The Japanese in Australian Society**

#### **7.3.1 Introduction**

As has been described in this report, Japanese language in Australia is a foreign, not a second, language. In this regard, it is unlike some of the other languages covered in the Key Languages reports. However, although this section will show that the Japanese population in Australia is small, the size of the community does not imply that opportunities for use of Japanese by Australians are limited. On the contrary, contact with Japanese nationals, in Australia or in Japan, constitutes an important component within many social and business spheres, including tourism. Our survey has established (Section 5.3.1) that secondary students attribute in many cases their motivation to study Japanese to the presence of the Japanese in Australia and that a considerable number of graduates work in Japanese companies (Chapter 6).

---

#### **7.3.2 The Japanese community in Australia**

Even though there were over 3,500 Japanese living in Australia at the turn of the century, the subsequent immigration policy acted to minimise Japanese entry, and despite some relaxation of the policy, the Japanese community resident in Australia remains small (McNamara and Coughlan 1992). The growth which did occur in the 1970s and especially the 1980s has not been due to migration but has been attributed to increases in the number of Japanese companies establishing branches and offices in this country and in the concomitant demand for a larger Japanese labour force (Curson and Curson 1982). A study conducted by the Australia-Japan Economic Institute (1989a) identified 572 Japanese-related

companies in Australia, including representative offices of Japanese companies and those with some Japanese equity participation. These companies employed over 2,000 Japanese in 1988-89.

Australian Census data show that people born in Japan who were residing in Australia in 1981 numbered 8,060 and that by 1986 this number had increased to 11,160; however, it constituted a mere 0.07 of the Australian population (Atsumi 1992). We can predict that a further rise in the number of Japanese residents will have occurred since that time. Another study using settler arrival data indicates that in the 1982 to 1991 period, 4040 people born in Japan entered Australia as migrants and that a further 1,292 changed their status to permanent resident in the same period (McNamara and Coughlan 1992:52). Analysis of the 1986 census data shows that two-thirds of the Japanese population were located in Sydney or Melbourne (Atsumi 1992), but more recent data indicate that among those migrating to Australia, Queensland has grown significantly in popularity, no doubt reflecting the growing demand for personnel in the tourism industry (McNamara and Coughlan 1992).

The Japanese in Australia are not a homogeneous group of people and one basic question is whether they are temporary migrants/residents, in other words 'sojourners', or permanent migrants. Curson and Curson (1982:479) described the characteristics for the two major groups of Japanese living in Sydney:

- A. Sojourners, by far the largest group, consisting of:
  1. Businessmen and professionals (and their families), often employed in an Australian branch of a Japanese company or else in an Australian business; and,
  2. Single adults, such as short-term visitors, students and other employees.
- B. The permanent Japanese community, made up of at least five subgroups:
  1. Business or professional personnel who have taken up permanent residency;
  2. Family groups settling recently, typically skilled and well educated;
  3. Individuals or families sponsored by relatives settled here, not necessarily with high occupational status;
  4. Unmarried individuals who have been able to change their residence status because of their employment skills; and,
  5. Japanese who came to Australia to reside with non-Japanese spouses.

The above description could be generalised to the wider Japanese population in Australia. Because of the strong sojourner characteristic of this group, ties tend to be weaker with the host country than is generally the case with migrants.

The short duration of their stay in Australia is a major characteristic of the Japanese. In 1986, 60% of them had been in Australia for less than four years. As the average stay of personnel in the business community is three to four years, we can imagine that a large proportion of this group belongs to the sojourner group. Of the remaining proportion, 13% of the Japanese have been in Australia for five to nine years (some of whom will also be sojourners), 12% for ten to 19 years, and less than 9% for over 20 years (Atsumi 1992:18).

Another feature concerns demographic characteristics, whereby the proportion of the population below the age of 15 is small and the proportion above 60 years

extremely small (Atsumi 1992:14). As regards occupational status, 58% of the working Japanese male population in Australia are concentrated in the managerial / administrative and professional categories, which is a much higher proportion than for the general population. Trades people (probably chefs) and personal service and sales are the next highest categories. For Japanese women, the highest categories are personal service and sales, clerical and professional categories (Atsumi 1992:24).

---

### 7.3.3 Contact within the tourism domain

Japanese tourism to Australia grew significantly during the 1980s and by mid-1991, the Japanese had become the largest group of international tourists to visit Australia. The growth rate was very high. Just 49,000 Japanese tourists travelled to Australia in 1980, but by 1985 this figure had more than doubled to 108,000 and in 1992 it was over 629,000. While the Japanese represented 5% of all in-bound tourists in 1980, by 1990 this had increased to 22%. Even so, this figure represented only 4 to 5% of the Japanese travellers going abroad. The Australian Tourism Commission predicts that the proportion of Japanese visitors to Australia will rise further and that by the end of the century, the Japanese will still be the largest group of overseas tourists to visit here. Furthermore, a recent report of the Australia Japan Business Forum (1992) predicts that tourism probably represents the best growth opportunity for Australia in the medium term.

The regions visited by Japanese tourists vary considerably. A report published by the Bureau of Tourism Research (1992:53) showed that while 83% visited NSW and 67% went to Queensland, Victoria received only 27% of Japanese travellers, Western Australia, 7%, South Australia 5%, and the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and Tasmania each receiving less than 5% (Bureau of Tourism Research 1992:53).

In the area of tourism, one program which promotes contact between Australians and the Japanese is the Working Holiday Scheme. Japan was added to Australia's network in 1980 and since that time, increasing numbers of young people have travelled to each other's country. One estimate is that 6,700 Australians between the ages of 18 and 30 years travelled to Japan under the Working Holiday program between 1987 and 1991. It is predicted that this figure will increase to 14,200 by 1995 (Tourism Training Australia 1992:15). The main objective of the scheme is to allow flexible holidays as well as some work. The program has been of vital importance in enabling a large number of young Australians, especially those who have completed formal studies in Japanese, to spend longer periods of residence in Japan which otherwise would not have been possible.

An important study was completed in 1992 with the view to planning for the language and cultural skills needed by personnel employed in tourism during the rest of the decade. Titled *Tourism 2000: Key Directions for Human Resource Development* (Tourism Training Australia 1992), it concluded that for the Asian markets, especially Japan, there was need for rapid and substantial increases in the numbers of management and staff with 'high level language skills', and for

substantial increases in customer contact staff with 'working language skills' (Tourism Training Australia 1992:10-11). Sectors covered by the report are accommodation, inbound operators, duty free stores, airlines, attractions, tour operators and hire cars, and actual projections on growth needs are included. While the estimated demand for Japanese is about four times that for Korean (which, in turn is higher than for Cantonese, Mandarin or Indonesian/Malay), less need has been identified for German, Scandinavian, Spanish, Italian and French (Tourism Training Australia 1992:12). Although in the *Tourism 2000* report the analysis of the potential supply of Australians with sufficient proficiency in Japanese is problematic, its publication represents an important step by an industry to plan for its language needs. To date, no other industry has attempted such detailed planning.

One controversial issue at present concerns the employment of Japanese-speaking Australians as against Japanese nationals in tourism-related positions, including tour guiding where use of the Japanese language is obligatory. Despite optimistic suggestions contained in the *Tourism 2000* report, the availability of a large number of Australians with sufficient competence and interest to become tour guides is highly unlikely. Some attempts are currently being made to develop national tour guiding courses and testing instruments, though these measures alone will be insufficient. Drysdale summarises the position well:

A lingering problem is the supply of Australians fluent in Japanese to the industry. Australia still cannot meet the demand for tour guides despite a vast improvement in the numbers of young people who now have Japanese language capacity. Most young Australians with sophisticated language skills still find the remuneration and conditions of working at home in the tourism industry less attractive than alternative employment. They can do better elsewhere. To entice them into the industry for short periods requires imaginative packages and a long-term strategy for effective deployment of language skills. Temporary working visas for Japanese will be necessary to fill this gap at least in the medium term until training strategies in place begin to take effect. Australia has to deepen its investment in language training, complemented by social and cultural skills, and develop the certification and employment strategies needed to overcome this bottleneck in the longer term (Australia-Japan Research Centre 1992:3).

As shown in Chapter 6, after teaching, graduates of Japanese have most commonly found employment in tourism-related positions in recent years. There is also evidence showing that a high proportion of non-Japanese speakers of the language who have not studied at university are also finding employment here. The levels of Japanese competence of quite a few employees is low and hence is a matter of concern. Certainly, there is scope within the educational sector for the development of further specialised courses to meet the needs of the tourism industry. Greater interaction between the corporate sector and educational providers in the design and implementation of better in-service and in-company courses is recommended.

## 7.4 The Linguistic Future of the Pacific

A few decades ago it was not unusual to assume that English would become not only the language of international communication but also the second or perhaps first language of many nations in the Pacific region. Today it is clear that these predictions were wrong. Although the pressure of English is still felt, individual languages of the region are keeping up well.

English is and no doubt will remain the leading language of international contact. However, other strong languages are emerging in the area. The role of Chinese and Indonesian in particular is changing and their future impact is likely to approximate the size of the population they represent. They are the languages of more than one country and do already serve as tools of international communication. They are already fully developed languages of internal use within their own communities. The power of Chinese and Indonesian can be expected to gain momentum but other languages of the area are thriving and will become the focus for attention in the future: Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, Tagalog, to name only a few.

Japanese is another language that will continue playing an important role in the Pacific. Although the relative economic power of Japan may decrease, as more and more Asian countries join the developed world, it will remain substantial. Its political activity within the Pacific region can be expected to grow. The role of Japan as one of the leaders in the area of science and technology cannot but further develop, and in culture Asian and other nations will continue looking towards Japan as an example of a postmodern society which has succeeded in retaining its classical culture along with developing a truly modern one.

The prestige of Japanese in the area is enormous already. While WWII has not been completely forgotten, it is also true that the economic success of Japan is gaining admirers throughout this region. The Japan Foundation estimates that out of the current learners of Japanese outside Japan, the great majority are people of East and South East Asia and Oceania (Japan Foundation, 1992). It is significant that in some of the countries of this region Japan is not only studied but studied in an efficient way. Although we do not predict that Japanese will become within the Pacific a 'language of wider communication', it will be a language very widely studied and widely spoken and read.

As far as Australia is concerned, after decades of neglect - the whole period before the second half of the 1960s - the number of people who can communicate with the Japanese is still very small. The balance must be redressed. Moreover, as this report argues, the need is not simply for linguistic competence. Even larger numbers of Australians must attain sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence, without which understanding of Japan and interaction with the Japanese is impossible.

We have emphasised that Australia is already doing extremely well in international comparison. Students numbers, healthy though insufficient, are one of the indicators. However, Australia is also leading in the qualitative aspects of Japanese language teaching: in the modernity of its teaching paradigm, in not limiting itself to the teaching of linguistic competence, in extending courses to the postgraduate level on the one hand and to secondary and

primary courses on the other, in introducing Japanese courses for special purposes, in providing external settings for acquisition and in guiding students in their independent acquisition. No other country in the world, apart from Japan, can be equally proud of its achievements.

The recommendations, contained at the beginning of this report, outline points and whole areas for further development.

---



## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Japan literacy

#### **Recommendation 1 Development of the study of Japanese**

Australia cannot afford to ignore Japan. Over the last three decades it has made giant steps towards understanding the country and being able to interact successfully with it. We recommend that the process, still incomplete, be further developed. This development should take place within the context of attempts to teach Asia-literacy in general. Due consideration must also be given to the maintenance and broadening of the understanding and interaction with countries with which Australian people have a special historical relationship. The understanding and interaction with a wide range of other countries of the world is equally essential, as well as the understanding of all strata of contemporary Australian society itself. It is necessary that any growth which takes place is a part of the general growth of all interaction studies undertaken in Australia.

#### **Recommendation 2 Study of Japanese for other than economic aims**

Economic motivation for such effort is natural and highly important. However, long term perspectives cannot be restricted to economic aims. We recommend that studies which aim at interacting with Japan systematically take into account not only Japan's economy but also its society and culture.

#### **Recommendation 3 Need for more than linguistic competence alone**

We consider that the aim of successful interaction with Japan presupposes three different competencies: linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural. We therefore recommend that one-sided reliance on the linguistic component be removed and that full recognition be given to the existing trends towards acquiring, along with rules of the Japanese language, the ability to communicate and the ability to interact in the widest sense of the word.

#### **Recommendation 4 Japan-literacy: Communication and area studies**

We consider it necessary for Japan-literacy, regarded as the acquisition of the three competencies, to grow substantially. We recommend that Japan-literacy 3 (the study of linguistic as well as sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence) be made available to a growing number of students; we also recommend that urgent consideration be given to the development of programs for Japan-literacy 2 (the acquisition of sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence) and for Japan-literacy 1 (the acquisition of sociocultural competence alone). The latter two literacies should be very widely available to a large number of students and adults in the community. See Chapter 3.

## Japanese language studies at the primary level

### **Recommendation 5 Expansion of primary level studies**

We recommend that the teaching of Japanese in primary schools reach levels comparable with those of other major languages taught in all States.

### **Recommendation 6 Aims of primary school teaching**

We recommend that serious consideration be given to the aims of teaching Japanese at the primary level. Due emphasis should not only be placed on teaching competence to communicate but also on teaching students how to understand other languages, communication systems, cultures and societies and how to apply this knowledge for a better understanding of their own society. A comparative perspective that surpasses the Japanese area is needed.

### **Recommendation 7 Course and materials development**

There is an urgent need to develop courses and materials for the primary level that would satisfy these requirements. A single course and set of materials (such as developed within the National Curriculum Project) should never be thought of as sufficient. The continuing emergence of new approaches must be encouraged. We recommend that grants be made available for creative projects to develop a variety of materials for the primary level.

### **Recommendation 8 Transition: primary - secondary**

We recommend that continuing effort be made to ensure a smooth transition between studies of Japanese at the primary and secondary levels.

## Japanese language studies at the secondary level

### **Recommendation 9 Removal of discrimination against language studies at upper secondary level**

We recommend that the Government education systems take active steps to remove the current situation of *de facto* discrimination against language studies at higher levels of secondary education. (Admittedly, not all blame for this situation should be put on the secondary level of education.)

### **Recommendation 10 State support structure**

At present some States and some systems within individual States show very little understanding of the support necessary for the further development of the study of Japanese at the secondary level. We recommend that all Government Departments of Education create a structure for the support of Japanese language studies and ensure adequate consultation with Japanese language teaching professionals.

**Recommendation 11 Co-ordination and diversity**

The present situation displays on the one hand lack of co-ordination between States and within States between individual schools and, on the other, the danger of future imposition of standardised curricula. Creative development will suffer under these conditions. We recommend that co-ordination and diversification go hand in hand in the further development of Japanese language study.

**Recommendation 12 Teaching about Japan**

We recommend that courses or components on Japan be developed and offered widely across the education system.

**Recommendation 13 Specialised courses**

There is a need for specialisation of courses within the secondary sector. We recommend that current trends in offering courses for tourism be intensified and that specialised courses (such as retail Japanese, Japanese for receptionists, etc) be developed and offered in the secondary sector. This will necessitate the formulation of Year 12 assessment programs which allow for such diversity in States where such programs do not already exist. Co-ordination with the TAFE system is also desirable.

**Recommendation 14 Accelerated courses and bilingual schools**

We recommend that a variety of accelerated courses, courses for advanced or semi-native speakers, be available along with the general Japanese courses available at present. We also recommend that each State fund a bilingual English-Japanese school, the graduates of which will achieve a very high level of Japanese competence.

**Recommendation 15 Non-interactive components of courses**

We believe that Japanese courses should not unilaterally concentrate on the acquisition of interactive competence. There is an equal need to use Japanese as a tool for understanding how human language, communication and interaction work. We recommend that this fact be acknowledged through funding the development of appropriate course components and teaching materials.

**Recommendation 16 Teacher certification**

The level of linguistic competence of some Japanese teachers is not satisfactory for teaching more advanced classes. However, since they perform a useful role at less advanced levels and as course directors, we recommend that they be certified, but only for levels of teaching for which their competence is adequate.

**Recommendation 17 Required competence of teachers**

We recommend that measures be taken at the national level against attempts to restrict further development of Japanese studies by creating unrealistic requirements on the competence of teachers of Japanese at the secondary level. To this end we recommend that

1. Three years of study at the tertiary level or equivalent be accepted as the minimum requirement for teacher registration;
2. Teacher registration acquire flexibility which will enable suitably qualified applicants educated in Japan to be accepted as teachers (subject to bridging courses); and,
3. Teachers be provided with the opportunity to use Teaching Assistants on a scale much wider than at present.

#### **Recommendation 18 Exchanges with Japan**

We recommend that all possible assistance be given to schools to establish exchange relationships with Japanese schools. This is particularly relevant for country schools where other forms of contact with native speakers of Japanese may be lacking.

### **Japanese language studies at the tertiary level**

#### **Recommendation 19 Extent of teaching**

We recommend that all students at the tertiary level be able to include Japanese study within their courses. All large institutions should have a Japanese teaching unit, while at smaller institutions arrangements should be made for students taking Japanese through cross-institutional enrolment programs or through distance education channels.

#### **Recommendation 20 Removal of course restrictions**

Within institutions which do offer Japanese, Japanese studies are still subject to a number of restrictions. We recommend that all faculties within Australian universities create conditions such that all students can participate in at least two semesters of Japanese studies.

#### **Recommendation 21 Combined and double degrees**

We recommend that combined and double degree courses which include a substantial component in Japanese be offered at all institutions which teach a major sequence in Japanese, and that these be available with all, or nearly all, degrees.

#### **Recommendation 22 Students with previous knowledge**

Students arrive at the university with various degrees of knowledge of Japanese and it can be expected that in the future the range of competence will be even more variable. Some institutions do not provide satisfactory arrangements to guarantee that students do not lose their initial advantage and are able to develop semi-native competence. Sometimes streaming is introduced only for the first year but discontinued later. We recommend that a committee survey details of the situation and makes recommendations concerning possible methods to remedy this situation.

**Recommendation 23 Students with semi-native competence**

Special attention is needed for students who enter universities with semi-native competence in the language. We recommend that one university in each capital city be funded to develop and offer special courses for such students. These courses should bring the students virtually to native level in Japanese.

**Recommendation 24 Tertiary courses in Japanese Studies**

We recommend that a wide range of courses in Japanese area studies, apart from the language, be widely offered at Australian institutions.

**Recommendation 25 Retention of diversity**

There is a need to retain the diversity of Australian tertiary language programs, with some of them being oriented towards the economy, others towards society, and still others toward culture. We recommend that such diversity, which guarantees the possibility of further development, be retained.

**Recommendation 26 Japanese for special purposes**

Japanese courses for special purposes are needed to cater for the diversified interests of tertiary students. We recommend that a co-ordinated effort be made to exchange information, curricula and teaching materials relevant to such courses and that the range of such courses be gradually increased.

**Recommendation 27 Survey of standards**

It is not unreasonable that some sections of the community are concerned about the standards of tertiary courses in Japanese. We recommend that a committee be formed by members of the profession and interested parties to survey the situation and prepare a document that would define the limits of effective tertiary programs. However, it must be borne in mind that any attempt at strict uniformity might lead to the loss of creativity and dynamism within the system.

**Recommendation 28 Honours and postgraduate programs**

The aspects of tertiary education in Japanese that need the maximum attention at present are Honours and postgraduate programs. On the one hand they provide the community with high level graduates; on the other, without them the profession cannot reproduce itself. We recommend that Honours and postgraduate programs be given priority attention within the tertiary Japanese language teaching system.

**Recommendation 29 Inter-institutional co-operation**

Our survey has shown that Honours and postgraduate programs at some institutions are very small. We recommend that universities be encouraged to initiate inter-institutional co-operation in this area.

**Recommendation 30 Financial support**

We recommend that Honours and postgraduate programs be provided with financial support that would enable students to undertake such programs and spend a part of their candidature in Japan. Undergraduate students who participate in study abroad of between three and twelve months should also be supported.

**Recommendation 31 On-going education**

The opportunity for on-going education and professional development in Japanese should exist for all those who need it, especially graduates who use Japanese professionally in their careers. We recommend that at least one institution in each capital city be nominated to develop such programs.

**Recommendation 32 Funding formula**

The funding formula for Japanese language programs is at present totally inadequate. We recommend that the target formula be 1:6 EFTSU.

**Recommendation 33 Ratio of casual staff**

We recommend that the engagement of casual staff should not exceed 25% of the teaching commitments of any department/unit teaching the Japanese language.

**Recommendation 34 Language program directors**

We believe that Japanese language programs can only be developed and effectively directed by specialists in Japanese language teaching. The current situation is that some Japanese language courses are under the direction of specialists from other disciplines or managed by junior staff with little experience. We recommend to the universities that their language programs be directed by Japanese teaching specialists.

**Issues at other levels****Recommendation 35 Intensive courses**

We recommend that the issue of intensive Japanese language training for Australians who are already employed and working in areas of contact with Japan be re-opened. Such training, once limited to intensive courses offered in Australia, or accompanied by a short period of stay in Japan, can now be offered fully in Japan, or with a substantial component taught there.

**Recommendation 36 Community courses**

We recommend that more serious attention be paid to community courses. We have identified three issues which are of particular importance for further development of such courses:

1. There is a need for specialisation, depending on the needs of the learners;
2. The courses should normally lean towards teaching about Japan and also about how to communicate with the Japanese in English; and,



3. There is a need for systematic guidance in acquiring and using language learner strategies.

## Methodology issues

### **Recommendation 37 Courses based on surveys**

Courses should be based on an analysis of students' motivation and needs. We recommend that funds be made available to develop and widely apply needs analysis to Japanese courses in Australia.

### **Recommendation 38 Surveys of effectiveness**

We also recommend that research on the effectiveness of various modes and methods of Japanese language teaching be given priority in approving ARC and internal university research grants. This also applies to the need to research various forms of in-country training.

### **Recommendation 39 Preferred methodology of teaching**

Not all methodologies are equally suitable. We recommend that different varieties of post-audiolingual communicative approaches be developed which best suit the needs of Australian learners.

### **Recommendation 40 Spoken and written language**

We recommend that equal attention be paid to the spoken and written language in general course majors. Since graduates often engage in informal translation work, it is desirable that some practice in translation is included. There may also be some limited need for programs for those who need to develop the spoken or the written language component only.

### **Recommendation 41 Staff awareness of recent methodologies**

There is a need to develop awareness in tertiary staff of new methodological developments in Japanese language teaching. We recommend that a travelling seminar be organised annually or once every two years to discuss such developments in each capital city. Such seminars should feature Japanese language specialists as well as applied linguists working in other language areas.

### **Recommendation 42 Language learner strategies**

Language learner strategies are of particular importance for Japanese language study. We recommend that they form a regular topic of the travelling seminar mentioned in the preceding recommendation.

### **Recommendation 43 New teaching technology**

Information on developments in the application of new technology to the teaching of Japanese needs to be regularly disseminated. We recommend that

channels for such dissemination of information be urgently developed. There is also a need for research on the effectiveness of new technology for particular purposes.

**Recommendation 44 Modern testing methods**

Familiarity of tertiary staff with modern testing methods seems to be limited. We recommend that information on testing become a standard component of the travelling language teaching seminars. Research into and development of new testing methods to meet a diverse range of needs is also necessary.

**Recommendation 45 Testing**

We recommend that a conference of representatives of departments teaching Japanese be organised to discuss the positive and negative implications of testing instruments which are currently being developed, as well as their validity and reliability. Forums for debate at the secondary school level should also be established. The priorities for future research and development work in the testing of Japanese should be determined only after wide-spread consultation with Japanese language teaching professionals and other interested parties.

## **Issues in teacher education**

**Recommendation 46 Components of teacher education**

The education of Japanese language teachers has been inherited from the past and needs urgent reform. We recommend that standard Diploma in Education (or equivalent) programs include the following components:

1. Development and maintenance of competence to use Japanese in actual interaction. This should include language study as well as specific attention to sociolinguistic and sociocultural issues;
2. Theoretical knowledge of Japanese language, sociolinguistic and sociocultural strategies;
3. Methodology specific to the teaching of Japanese;
4. General educational theory and methodology; and,
5. Teaching practice.

None of these components should be absent. Co-operation with units teaching Japanese Studies should be encouraged in order to provide components 1, 2 and to some extent 3 efficiently and at a high standard.

**Recommendation 47 In-service training for teachers**

The linguistic competence of some Japanese teachers in primary and secondary schools seems to be insufficient for teaching more advanced classes. We recommend that continuing attention be given to this problem and a sufficient variety of courses be available for in-service training.

**Recommendation 48 Competence of teachers**

There is a danger of placing either too little or too much emphasis on the linguistic competence of Japanese language teachers. We recommend that institutions take a realistic view of the present situation and realise both that:

1. teachers with low competence in the language should not be allowed to take Japanese classes; and,
2. the need for a very high level of competence is unnecessary if native teaching assistants or other ancillary staff are employed.

**Recommendation 49 Attracting recent graduates**

We recommend that every effort be made to attract recent graduates of Japanese to join the teaching profession. For this purpose it will be necessary to expand the intake to the Japanese programs within the Education Faculties.

**Recommendation 50 Theoretical knowledge**

Theoretical knowledge of Japanese language, sociolinguistics and culture/society is not provided in all undergraduate courses in Australia. We recommend that an appeal be made to Japanese departments/units to introduce appropriate subjects to cover these areas. Such subjects should also be available to Diploma in Education students who missed them in the course of their undergraduate training.

**Recommendation 51 Japanese teaching methodologies**

Specialised Japanese teaching methodology, as opposed to general LOTE methodology, is gradually being introduced at many institutions. However, we recommend that the range of the courses be surveyed and recommendations made for a high quality program that would utilise the top level of available expertise. Appropriate methods of delivery also require consideration.

**Recommendation 52 Primary training institutions**

We recommend that Japanese teacher education programs containing all the components described above be established at institutions which produce primary school teachers either directly or through inter-institutional co-operation.

## **Community understanding**

**Recommendation 53 Awareness of differences**

Employers and the general public do not always seem to understand that the task of learning Japanese is different from the task of learning a cognate European language. We recommend that measures be taken to educate the public in general with regard to the realistic degrees of competence which can be expected from learners in Japanese courses, particularly at the primary, secondary and community levels. However, it is essential for the public to understand that sufficient competence can be, and is being, achieved by large numbers of Australian learners of Japanese at the higher education level.

## Supporting structures

### **Recommendation 54 Association, newsletter, meetings**

We recommend that the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, State Japanese Language Teachers' Associations and the Modern Language Teachers' Associations be approached to assist in:

1. Creating a national association of teachers of the Japanese language;
2. Publishing a Japanese language-teaching newsletter; and,
3. Organising conferences, symposia and (travelling) seminars for Japanese language teachers.

### **Recommendation 55 Regional co-operation**

We recommend that in pursuing their aims, Japanese language teachers in Australia should co-operate with Japanese language teachers in South East Asia, East Asia and the USA. Special attention should also be given to co-operation with the Japanese language teaching profession in Japan.

## REFERENCES

- Age, 21/6/93, 'One in 10 students are 'independent'.
- Asian Studies Council, 1988, *A National Strategy for the Study of Asia in Australia*. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Asian Studies Review, 1991, Asian Studies and Australian Business. *Asian Studies Review*, 14, 3, pp.1-42.
- Atsumi, R, 1992, 'A demographic and socio-economic profile of the Japanese residents in Australia'. In J.E. Coughlan (ed.), *The Diverse Asians*. Griffith University, Centre for the Study of Australia-Asia Relations.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1992, *Schools, Australia 1991*. Canberra, Commonwealth of Australia. Cat. No. 4221.0
- Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1993, *First Count - National Summary 1991 Census*. Cat. No.2702.0
- Australia Japan Business Forum, 1992, *Japan: 'Adjusting to Affluence'*. ACT, Australia Japan Business Forum.
- Australian-Japan Economic Institute, 1989a, *A Survey of Japanese Business Activity in Australia*. Sydney, Australia-Japan Economic Institute.
- Australia-Japan Economic institute, 1989b, *Developing the Australia-Japan Link*. Sydney, Australia-Japan Economic Institute.
- Australia-Japan Research Centre, 1987, *Japanese Studies in Australia and the Training of Australians to do Business with Japan*. Canberra, Australia-Japan Research Centre.
- Australia-Japan Research Centre, 1989, *Japanese Studies in Australia*. Canberra, Australia-Japan Research Centre.
- Australia-Japan Research Centre, 1991, *Japan and the World*. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia. Vols 1, 2 and 3. Canberra, Australia-Japan Research Centre.
- Australian*, 25/11/92, 'Language demands surprise authorities'.
- Australian Manufacturing Council, 1990, *The Global Challenge: Australian Manufacturing in the 1990's*. Australia, Australian Manufacturing Council.
- Australian Tourism Industry Association and Inbound Tourism Organisation of Australia, 1991, 'Tourism Industry Submission on the Commonwealth's Green paper on Australian Literacy and Language Policy for the 1990s'. Unpublished paper.
- Bachman, L.F., 1990, *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Brislin, R.W., 1981, *Cross-cultural Encounters: Face to Face Interactions*. New York, Pergamon Press.
- Brown, A., 1993, 'LSP testing: the role of linguistic and real-world criteria'. Paper presented at the SEAMEO-RELC Regional Seminar, Singapore, April 19-21, 1993.
- Buising, C., 1991, 'Opportunities for Australian teachers of Japanese to upgrade language and methodology skills in Japan'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.217-227.
- Bureau of Tourism Research, 1992, *Japanese Tourism in Australia*. International Visitor Survey Major Market Report Japan 1990. Canberra, Bureau of Tourism Research.
- Clarke, H. D. B., 1989, 'Japanese studies at the University of Sydney'. *Japanese Study in Australia: a report commissioned by the Japan Foundation and prepared by the Australia-Japan research Centre*. Canberra, Australia-Japan Research Centre, pp.89-92.
- Claremont, Y., 1992, 'Japanese for native speakers in HSC'. Paper presented at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Conference, University of Sydney, 10-13 July 1992.
- Clyne, M.G., 1981, 'Second generation' foreigner talk in Australia'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28, pp.69-80.
- Commonwealth Department of Tourism, 1992, *Tourism Australia's Passport to Growth*. Canberra, Department of Tourism. A national tourism strategy.
- Coulmas, F., 1989, 'The surge of Japanese'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 80, pp.115-131.
- Cunningham, E., 1992, 'Japan literacy among Australian bankers in Japan'. In J.V. Neustupný (ed.) *The Relevance of Japanese Language Teaching*. Melbourne, Japanese Studies Centre, pp.35-40.
- Curson, S. and P. Curson, 1982, 'The Japanese in Sydney'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 5, 4, pp.478-512.
- Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1991, *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy*. Vols 1 and 2. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Department of School Education, Victoria, 1992, *Languages other than English in Government Schools 1991*. Victoria, Department of School Education.

- Distance Education and Technology in Language Teaching*, 1990, Unpublished Consultancy Paper for the Department of Employment, Education and Training.
- Drysdale, P., N. Viviani, A. Watanabe and I. Yamazawa, 1989, *The Australia-Japan Relationship: Towards the Year 2000*. Canberra, Australia-Japan Research Centre.
- Ellis, R., 1985, *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Fan, S.K., 1992, 'The acquisition of Japanese by Chinese students in Australia: An example of foreign language learning through a non-native language'. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia, University of New England, July 1992.
- Forster, B., 1992, 'The role of the Saturday Morning School of Modern Languages in the provision of Languages other than English in Victoria'. Paper presented at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Conference, University of Sydney, 10-13 July 1992.
- Gardner, R.C. and W.E. Lambert, 1972, *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass, Newbury House.
- Garnaut, R., 1989, *Australia and the North-East Asian Ascendancy*. Australia, Commonwealth of Australia.
- Gossip, C., 1993, 'French lessons translate into living language we need'. *Campus Magazine* 3, 20:10,20.
- Hardacre, H., 1992, 'Language competence and postgraduate studies: the case of Japanese studies'. *Asian Studies Review* 15, 3, pp.48-53.
- Healy, P., 1990, 'The Garnaut Report: Implications for Asia'. *Asian Studies Review*, 13, 3, pp.68-75.
- Hymes, D.H., 1962, 'The ethnography of speaking.' In T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturtevant (eds) *Anthropology and Human Behaviour*. Washington, Anthropological Society of Washington. Reprinted in *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, J.A. Fishman (ed.), The Hague, Mouton 1968, pp.99-138.
- Hymes, D.H., 1964, 'Introduction: toward ethnographies of communication'. In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds) *The Ethnography of Communication*, *American Anthropologist* 66, Special Publication, 6,2, pp.1-34.
- Hymes, D. H., 1972, 'Models of the interaction of language and social life'. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.35-71.
- Itani-Adams, Y., 1992, Course design for a distance education Japanese language course. Paper presented at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Conference, University of Sydney, 10-13 July 1992.
- Japan Foundation and Association of International Education, 1989, *The Japanese language proficiency test. Summary of the results*. Tokyo, Japan Foundation.
- Japan Foundation, 1992, *Kaigai no nihongo kyooiku no genjo* (Japanese language education overseas). Japan, Japan Foundation Language Institute.
- Japanese Language Teachers' Association of Victoria, 1992, 'Current situation of Japanese language education'. JLTAV Inc. Newsletter, Spring 1992, pp.22-43.
- Jeffrey, R., 1990, *Asia Across the Curriculum*. Report and Recommendations of the First National Conference on Asian Studies in Schools. Asian Studies Council.
- Jernudd, B. and J.V. Neustupný, 1987, Language planning: for whom? *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Language Planning*, L. Laforge (ed.) pp.69-84.
- Jernudd, B. and J.V. Neustupný, 1991, 'Multi-disciplined language planning'. In D.F. Marshall (ed.) *Language Planning - Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp.29-36.
- Jorden, E.H. and R.D. Lambert, 1991, *Japanese Language Instruction in the United States: Resources, Practice, and Investment Strategy*. Washington, National Foreign Language Centre.
- Key Centre for Asian Languages and Studies, 1992, National Forum on Japanese Language Teacher Education. Proceedings of conference, 21-22 September 1992.
- Krashen, S., 1985, *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Great Britain, Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and M.H. Long, 1991, *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London, Longman.
- Lo Bianco, J., 1987, *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Makino, S., 1991, ACTFL no gaikokugo nooryoku kijun (Issues in ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and Oral Proficiency Interview.) *Sekai no Nihongo Kyooiku* Vol. 1, pp.15-32.
- Malcolm, I., 1992, 'LOTE in Higher Education: Possibilities for intensive and immersion approaches'. Paper presented at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Conference, University of Sydney, 10-13 July 1992.
- Marriott, H.E., 1991a, 'Asian studies and Australian business: seeking new approaches'. *Asian Studies Review* 14, 3, pp.15-26.
- Marriott, H.E., 1991b, 'Expanding Japanese language provisions through distance education: the National Asian Languages Project'. *Japanese Studies Association of Australia*, 11, 3, pp.33-47.



- Marriott, H.E., 1991c, 'Formulating policy for Summer Schools'. *Babel*, 26, 2, pp.18-25.
- Marriott, H.E., 1991d, 'Language planning and language management for tourism shopping situations'. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics Series S*, 8, pp.191-222.
- Marriott, H.E., 1992a, 'Common perceptions of the economic function of Japanese language teaching and learning'. In J.V. Neustupný (ed.) *The Relevance of Japanese Language Teaching*. Melbourne, Japanese Studies Centre, pp.14-34.
- Marriott, H.E., 1992b, 'The teaching of Japanese in Australia'. *Vox*, 6, pp.21-32.
- Marriott, H.E., 1993, 'Accelerating foreign language acquisition: Youth exchanges from Australia to Japan'. Paper presented at the Youth Exchange Officers Meeting, Rotary International Congress, 21-22 May, Melbourne.
- Marriott, H. and N. Yamada, 1991, 'Japanese discourse in tourism shopping situations'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.155-168.
- McBride, J., 1991, 'Computer-assisted instruction in the teaching of Japanese as a second language'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.186-207.
- McCormack G., 1989, 'The teaching of Asian languages'. *Asian Studies Association of Australia Review*, 13, 2, pp.25-31.
- Mitchell, A., 1991, 'Teaching technical Japanese - a case study of language for a specific purpose'. *Babel*, 26, 1, pp.4-9.
- McKay, E. (ed.), 1988, *Towards an Asia-Literate Society*. Current Issues in Asian Studies Series 3. Australia, Asian Studies Association of Australia.
- McNamara, D. and J. Coughlan, 1992, 'Recent trends in Japanese migration to Australia and the characteristics of recent Japanese immigrants settling in Australia'. In *Japanese Studies Bulletin* 12.1. pp.50-73.
- Miyazaki, S., 1991, 'Japanese immersion programs at tertiary levels: significance in interactive teaching'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.175-181.
- Miyazaki, S., 1992, 'Kyooshitsu bamen ni okeru sankasha no tayooka to intaakushon' (The variation of participants and interaction in Japanese language classrooms: the use of teaching assistants and its significance). Proceedings of the Commemorative Conference for 30th anniversary of the founding of the Society for Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language, pp.43-48.
- Mouer, R., 1992, 'Narrowing the focus on Japan literacy: a framework for empirical research'. In J.V. Neustupný (ed.) *The Relevance of Japanese Language Teaching*. Japanese Studies Centre, pp.54-62.
- Muraoka, H., 1991, 'Interactive competence of learners of Japanese in authentic situations: a case study of visitor sessions at Monash University'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.150-151.
- National Languages Institute of Australia, 1991, *Survey of Languages other than English in TAFE: A Report*. Prepared by the NLLIA Language and Technology Centre at The Centre for Language Teaching and Research, The University of Queensland.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1973, 'Sociolinguistics and the language teacher'. In M. Rado. (ed.), *Language Teaching: Problems and Solutions?* Bundoora, La Trobe University, pp.31-66.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1976, 'Some current trends in Japanese language teaching in Australia'. *Linguistic Communications*, 17, pp.1-22.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1985, 'Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations'. In J.B. Pride (ed.) *Cross-cultural Encounters*. Melbourne, River Seine, pp.44-64.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1988a, 'Australia and Japan: cross-cultural communication problems'. *Vox*, 1, pp.28-32.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1988b, 'Oosutoraria' (Australia). *Nihongo* 3, pp.19-24.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1989, *Strategies for Asia and Japan Literacy*. Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre, 15. Melbourne, Japanese Studies Centre.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1990a, 'Language planning and the testing of Japanese in Australia'. Paper presented for the International Working Group on Assessment of Proficiency Levels for Students of Japanese as a Foreign Language, Canberra, June 1990.
- Neustupný, J.V., R. Spence-Brown and K. Yoshimitsu, 1990b, 'Oosutoraria de nihongo o manabu, osieru' (Learning and Teaching Japanese in Australia). *Oosutoraria riyuigaku jiten '90* Handbook for studying in Australia. Tokyo, Aruku Press, pp.156-167.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1991a, 'Atarashii nihongo kyoouiku no tame ni' (Towards new perspectives in Japanese language teaching). *Sekai no Nihongo Kyoouiku* 1, pp.1-14.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1991b, 'Nihongo kyooshi yoosei to nihongo nooryoku kentei shiken' (Training of Japanese language teachers and the Japanese language teacher examination). In T. Ueno (ed.) *Nihongo to Nihongo Kyoouiku* 16, Meiji Shoin, Tokyo, pp.441-466.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1992a, 'Functions of Japanese language teaching: a framework'. In J.V. Neustupný, (ed.) *The Relevance of Japanese Language Teaching*. Melbourne, Japanese Studies Centre, pp.1-10.

- Neustupný, J.V., 1992b, (ed.) *The Relevance of Japanese Language Teaching*. Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre, 13. Melbourne, Japanese Studies Centre.
- Neustupný, J.V., 1992c, The use of teaching assistants in Japanese language teaching. *Sekai no Nihongo Kyooiku* 2, pp.199-213.
- Neustupný, J.V. and H. Rowe (eds), 1976, Proceedings of the First Australian Seminar on Japanese Language Teaching. *Linguistic Communications*.
- Nicholas, H., H. Moore, M. Clyne and A. Pauwels, 1993, *Languages at the Crossroads: Report of the National Enquiry into the Employment and Supply of Teachers of Languages Other Than English*. Melbourne, NLLIA.
- Pinfold, C., 1991, 'The interactive videodisc: language partner - Japanese 1'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.208-209.
- Pinkerton, Y. and A. Brown, 1993, 'Oosutoraria de kaihatsu sareta kankoo gaido no tame no nihongo tesuto' (Japanese tests developed in Australia for tour guides). *Gekkan Nihongo*, 11, pp.98-87.
- Report of the Inquiry into the Teaching of Asian Studies and Languages in Higher Education, 1989, *Asia in Australian Higher Education*. Vols 1 and 2.
- Report of the Review of the Teaching of Modern Languages in Higher Education, 1991, *Widening our Horizon*. Vols I and II. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers, 1986, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, H., 1989, *Japanese language teaching in non-Government primary schools in Victoria*. Unpublished MA thesis, Monash University.
- Roper, L., 1992, Pre-Service Diploma in Education Courses in Victoria. Papers presented at the National Forum on Japanese Language Teacher Education 21-22 September 1992. Key Centre for Asian Languages and Studies, The University of Queensland.
- Shohamy, E., 1992, The concurrent validity of direct vs. semi direct tests of oral proficiency. Unpublished paper prepared for AERA Convention, San Francisco, CA.
- Singleton, D., 1989, *Language Acquisition: The Age Factor*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Skehan, P., 1988, 'State of the art article. Language testing. Part 1'. *Language Teaching* 4, 1, pp.211-221.
- Skoutarides, A., 1986, *Foreigner talk in Japanese*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University.
- Smith, F., 1988, *The teaching of Japanese in Australian secondary schools by native speakers: an empirical study*. Unpublished MA preliminary thesis, Monash University.
- Spence-Brown, R., 1989b, 'Japanese Studies at Monash University'. In Australia-Japan Research Centre, *Japanese Studies in Australia*. Canberra, Australia-Japan Research Centre, pp.59-66.
- Spence-Brown, R., 1991, 'Development of new courses at Monash University'. *Japan and the World*. Vol. 3. Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, pp.182-185.
- Spence-Brown, R., 1992, 'The needs of students of Japanese: results of a survey of graduates'. In J.V. Neustupný (ed.) *The Relevance of Japanese Language Teaching*. Melbourne, Japanese Studies Centre, pp.41-48.
- Stanley, J., D. Ingram and G. Chittick, 1990, *The Relationship between International Trade and Linguistic Competence*. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Taylor, C., E. Wylie, A. Brown and A. Iddicoat, 1992, 'The Japanese language proficiency project'. *Japanese Studies Bulletin* 12, 2, pp.67-79.
- Tourism Training Australia, 1992, *Tourism 2000: Key Directions for Human Resource Development*. Prepared by The National Centre for Studies in Travel and Tourism and R.T. Kinnaird and Associates.
- Tsung, L., 1992, 'Asian language teaching: Prospects and problems'. Paper presented at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Conference, University of Sydney, 10-13 July 1992.
- Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Board, 1989, *Japanese Group 1*. Melbourne: VCAB.
- Wilson, A., 1993, 'Conversation partners: helping students gain a global perspective through cross-cultural experiences'. *Theory Into Practice* 32, 1, pp.21-26.
- Yasumoto, S., 1992, 'Japanese for specific purposes: application for engineering professionals and beyond'. Paper presented at the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia Conference, University of Sydney, 10-13 July 1992.
- Yoshimitsu, K., R. Spence-Brown and J.V. Neustupný 1992, 'Oosutoraria de nihongo o oshieru' (Teaching the Japanese language in Australia). In *Oosutoraria riyugaku: jiten '92* (Handbook for studying in Australia 1992). ALC, Tokyo, pp.118-123.

## APPENDIX 1 ENROLMENTS IN JAPANESE ACCORDING TO YEAR AT THE PRIMARY LEVEL<sup>5</sup>

| Year  | Prep<br>M F | Year 1<br>M F | Year 2<br>M F | Year 3<br>M F | Year 4<br>M F | Year 5<br>M F | Year 6<br>M F | All | Total |
|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------|
| 1988  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |     |       |
| Govt  | -           | 85            | 51            | 50            | 86            | 79            | 140           | 491 |       |
| Ind.  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     | 491   |

Table 1  
Number of students studying Japanese at the primary level in Queensland

| Year  | Prep<br>M F | Year 1<br>M F | Year 2<br>M F | Year 3<br>M F | Year 4<br>M F | Year 5<br>M F | Year 6<br>M F | All   | Total |
|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| 1988  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |       |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |       |       |
| Ind.  | -           | 10 7          | 37 18         | 93 46         | 35 50         | 51 56         | 61 62         | 526   |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -     | 526   |
| 1990  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |       |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |       |       |
| Ind.  | -           | 52 52         | 60 57         | 92 108        | 130 214       | 276 245       | 162 102       | 1,556 |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | 96            | -             | 96    | 1,646 |
| 1991  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |       |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |       |       |
| Ind.  | 49 71       | 114 115       | 125 107       | 146 182       | 190 202       | 255 348       | 346 311       | 2,561 |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -     | 2,561 |

Table 2  
Number of students studying Japanese at the primary level in Victoria

| Year  | Prep<br>M F | Year 1<br>M F | Year 2<br>M F | Year 3<br>M F | Year 4<br>M F | Year 5<br>M F | Year 6<br>M F | Year 7<br>M F | All | Total |
|-------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------|
| 1988  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |     |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     |       |
| Ind.  | 3 4         | 21 16         | 15 14         | 14 15         | 13 16         | 16 11         | 13 14         | 12 13         | 210 |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     | 210   |
| 1989  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |     |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     |       |
| Ind.  | 5 20        | 8 6           | -             | -             | -             | 41            | 42            | 102           | 224 |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     | 224   |
| 1990  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |     |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     |       |
| Ind.  | 86 15       | 8 3           | 3 4           | 4 1           | 3 0           | 35 65         | 34 77         | 56 116        | 510 |       |
| Cath. | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     | 510   |
| 1991  |             |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |     |       |
| Govt  | -           | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             | -             |     |       |
| Ind.  | 26 33       | 53 46         | 50 36         | 39 38         | 38 36         | 73 82         | 65 104        | 84 118        | 921 |       |
| Cath. | 58          | 56            | 34 37         | 34 34         | 24 29         | 25 30         | 20 22         | 452           | 855 | 1,776 |

Table 3  
Number of students studying Japanese at the primary level in South Australia

| Year        | Primary years |       | All   |
|-------------|---------------|-------|-------|
|             | M             | F     |       |
| 1989        |               |       |       |
| Govt & Ind. | 542           | 847   | 1,389 |
| Cath.       |               |       |       |
| 1990        |               |       |       |
| Govt & Ind. | 1,348         | 1,124 | 2,472 |
| Cath.       |               |       |       |
| 1991        |               |       |       |
| Govt & Ind. | 1,471         | 1,206 | 2,677 |
| Cath.       |               |       |       |

Table 4  
Number of students studying Japanese at the primary level in the ACT

| Year  | Prep |   | Year 1 |    | Year 2 |    | Year 3 |   | Year 4 |    | Year 5 |    | Year 6 |    | Year 7 |    | All |
|-------|------|---|--------|----|--------|----|--------|---|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|-----|
|       | M    | F | M      | F  | M      | F  | M      | F | M      | F  | M      | F  | M      | F  | M      | F  |     |
| 1991  |      |   |        |    |        |    |        |   |        |    |        |    |        |    |        |    |     |
| Govt  | 1    | 3 | 25     | 24 | 20     | 24 | 4      | 5 | 31     | 16 | 16     | 15 | 43     | 58 | 59     | 82 | 426 |
| Ind.  | -    |   | -      |    | -      |    | -      |   | -      |    | -      |    | -      |    |        |    |     |
| Cath. |      |   |        |    |        |    |        |   |        |    |        |    |        |    |        |    |     |

Table 5  
Number of students studying Japanese at the primary level in the Northern Territory

## APPENDIX 2 ENROLMENTS IN JAPANESE ACCORDING TO YEAR AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL<sup>6</sup>

| 1988  | Year 8 |       | Year 9 |       | Year 10 |       | Year 11 |     | Year 12 |     | All    | Total  |
|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-----|---------|-----|--------|--------|
|       | M      | F     | M      | F     | M       | F     | M       | F   | M       | F   |        |        |
| Govt  | 1,958  | 1,912 | 731    | 1,145 | 357     | 687   | 118     | 301 | 69      | 214 | 7,492  |        |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | 821     | -     | 237     | -   | 192     | -   | 1,250  |        |
| Cath. | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -     | -       | -   | -       | -   | -      | 8,742  |
| 1989  |        |       |        |       |         |       |         |     |         |     |        |        |
| Govt  | 2,418  | 2,422 | 810    | 1,553 | 500     | 917   | 130     | 436 | 102     | 278 | 9,566  |        |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | 1,115   | -     | 362     | -   | 218     | -   | 1,695  |        |
| Cath. | 1,296  | 1,404 | 314    | 575   | 180     | 224   | 17      | 122 | 3       | 58  | 4,193  | 15,454 |
| 1990  |        |       |        |       |         |       |         |     |         |     |        |        |
| Govt  | 3,087  | 3,051 | 744    | 1,553 | 536     | 1,110 | 152     | 468 | 103     | 378 | 11,182 |        |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | 1,833   | -     | 460     | -   | 324     | -   | 2,617  |        |
| Cath. | 1,434  | 1,944 | 523    | 506   | 356     | 376   | 33      | 84  | 11      | 86  | 5,353  | 19,152 |
| 1991  |        |       |        |       |         |       |         |     |         |     |        |        |
| Govt  | 3,637  | 3,587 | 990    | 1,927 | 531     | 1,171 | 107     | 604 | 157     | 437 | 13,148 |        |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | 2,093   | -     | 669     | -   | 422     | -   | 3,184  |        |
| Cath. | 1,496  | 2,031 | 469    | 818   | 289     | 503   | 72      | 163 | 33      | 91  | 5,965  | 22,297 |

Table 1  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in Queensland

| 1988  | Year 7 |       | Year 8 |       | Year 9 |       | Year 10 |     | Year 11 |     | Year 12 |     | All   | Total |
|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-------|-------|
|       | M      | F     | M      | F     | M      | F     | M       | F   | M       | F   | M       | F   |       |       |
| Govt  | 736    | 599   | 616    | 801   | 283    | 486   | 201     | 348 | 113     | 203 | 70      | 160 | 4,616 |       |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | 278     | 137 | 216     | 47  | 278   |       |
| Cath. | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     | 4,894 |
| 1989  |        |       |        |       |        |       |         |     |         |     |         |     |       |       |
| Govt  | 1,038  | 1,008 | 946    | 1,318 | 497    | 882   | 246     | 494 | 141     | 243 | 71      | 179 | 7,063 |       |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | 287     | 355 | 231     | 171 | 644   |       |
| Cath. | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     | 7,707 |
| 1990  |        |       |        |       |        |       |         |     |         |     |         |     |       |       |
| Govt  | 932    | 968   | 1,249  | 1,619 | 610    | 1,291 | 444     | 892 | 128     | 342 | 124     | 194 | 8,793 |       |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | 299     | 313 | 254     | 234 | 700   |       |
| Cath. | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     | 9,493 |
| 1991  |        |       |        |       |        |       |         |     |         |     |         |     |       |       |
| Govt  | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     |       |
| Ind.  | -      | -     | -      | -     | -      | -     | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     |       |
| Cath. | 0      | 700   | 0      | 35    | 24     | 29    | 0       | 20  | 0       | 8   | 0       | 0   | 816   | 816   |

Table 2  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in NSW

<sup>6</sup> Source: documents from the various systems

| 1988  | Year 7 |      | Year 8 |     | Year 9 |     | Year 10 |     | Year 11 |     | Year 12 |     | All   | Total  |
|-------|--------|------|--------|-----|--------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-------|--------|
|       | M      | F    | M      | F   | M      | F   | M       | F   | M       | F   | M       | F   |       |        |
| Govt  | -      | -    | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   |       |        |
| Ind.  | 412    | 351  | 385    | 567 | 190    | 426 | 100     | 271 | 24      | 151 | 21      | 82  | 2,980 |        |
| Cath. | 444    |      | 350    |     | 165    |     | 49      |     | 41      |     | 22      |     | 1,071 | 4,051  |
| 1989  |        |      |        |     |        |     |         |     |         |     |         |     |       |        |
| Govt  | 594    | 661  | 413    | 369 | 317    | 346 | 165     | 175 | 76      | 53  | 50      | 19  | 3,238 |        |
| Ind.  | -      | -    | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     |        |
| Cath. | 690    |      | 548    |     | 299    |     | 168     |     | 25      |     | 26      |     | 1,756 | 4,994  |
| 1990  |        |      |        |     |        |     |         |     |         |     |         |     |       |        |
| Govt  | -      | -    | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     |        |
| Ind.  | 445    | 595  | 354    | 836 | 360    | 654 | 179     | 423 | 49      | 245 | 25      | 151 | 4,316 |        |
| Cath. | 1,008  |      | 847    |     | 297    |     | 259     |     | 97      |     | 23      |     | 2,531 | 6,847  |
| 1991  |        |      |        |     |        |     |         |     |         |     |         |     |       |        |
| Govt  | 962    | 1098 | 760    | 766 | 514    | 494 | 238     | 248 | 89      | 64  | 33      | 20  | 5,286 |        |
| Ind.  | 854    | 778  | 719    | 943 | 444    | 693 | 260     | 499 | 77      | 251 | 39      | 164 | 5,721 |        |
| Cath. | -      | -    | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -       | -   | -     | 11,007 |

Table 3  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in Victoria

| 1991  | Year 7 |     | Year 8 |     | Year 9 |    | Year 10 |    | Year 11 |    | Year 12 |     | All   |
|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|----|---------|----|---------|----|---------|-----|-------|
|       | M      | F   | M      | F   | M      | F  | M       | F  | M       | F  | M       | F   |       |
| Govt  | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -  | -       | -  | -       | -  | -       | -   |       |
| Ind.  | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -  | -       | -  | -       | -  | -       | -   |       |
| Cath. | 148    | 229 | 33     | 104 | 20     | 77 | 7       | 44 | 6       | 27 | 214     | 418 | 1,327 |

Table 4  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in Western Australia.

| 1988  | Year 7 |     | Year 8 |     | Year 9 |     | Year 10 |     | Year 11 |    | Year 12 |    | All   | Total |
|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|---------|-----|---------|----|---------|----|-------|-------|
|       | M      | F   | M      | F   | M      | F   | M       | F   | M       | F  | M       | F  |       |       |
| Govt  | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  |       |       |
| Ind.  | 12     | 13  | 85     | 54  | 67     | 59  | 54      | 40  | 22      | 29 | 9       | 12 | 456   |       |
| Cath. | 8      | 4   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  | 12    | 468   |
| 1989  |        |     |        |     |        |     |         |     |         |    |         |    |       |       |
| Govt  | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  | -     |       |
| Ind.  |        | 102 | 113    | 118 | 36     | 140 | 33      | 68  | 23      | 35 | 8       | 25 | 701   |       |
| Cath. | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  | -     | 701   |
| 1990  |        |     |        |     |        |     |         |     |         |    |         |    |       |       |
| Govt  | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  | -     |       |
| Ind.  | 56     | 116 | 170    | 227 | 109    | 108 | 48      | 76  | 29      | 28 | 15      | 20 | 1,002 |       |
| Cath. | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  | -     | 1,002 |
| 1991  |        |     |        |     |        |     |         |     |         |    |         |    |       |       |
| Govt  | -      | -   | -      | -   | -      | -   | -       | -   | -       | -  | -       | -  | -     |       |
| Ind.  | 84     | 118 | 172    | 166 | 116    | 213 | 89      | 126 | 20      | 75 | 12      | 19 | 1,210 |       |
| Cath. | 8      | 4   | 90     | 32  | 50     | 30  | 18      | -   | 12      | -  | 8       | -  | 252   | 1,462 |

Table 5  
Number of pupils studying Japanese at the secondary level in South Australia



| 1989        | Year 7 - 10 |       | Year 11 - 12 |     | All   | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-----|-------|-------|
|             | M           | F     | M            | F   |       |       |
| Govt & Ind. | 827         | 1,326 | 79           | 219 | 2,451 | 2,451 |
| Cath.       | -           | -     | -            | -   | -     | -     |
| 1990        |             |       |              |     |       |       |
| Govt & Ind. | 1,121       | 1,664 | 96           | 221 | 3,102 | 3,102 |
| Cath.       | -           | -     | -            | -   | -     | -     |
| 1991        |             |       |              |     |       |       |
| Govt & Ind. | 949         | 1,418 | 82           | 217 | 2,666 | 2,666 |
| Cath.       | -           | -     | -            | -   | -     | -     |

Table 6  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in the ACT

| 1988  | Year 7 |   | Year 8 |   | Year 9 |   | Year 10 |   | Year 11/12 |   | All   | Total |
|-------|--------|---|--------|---|--------|---|---------|---|------------|---|-------|-------|
|       | M      | F | M      | F | M      | F | M       | F | M          | F |       |       |
| Govt  | 531    |   | 478    |   | 85     |   | 50      |   | 467        |   | 1,611 | 1,611 |
| Ind.  | -      |   | -      |   | -      |   | -       |   | -          |   | -     | -     |
| Cath. | -      |   | -      |   | -      |   | -       |   | -          |   | -     | -     |
| 1989  |        |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |            |   |       |       |
| Govt  | 1,333  |   | 573    |   | 214    |   | 89      |   | 474        |   | 2,683 |       |
| Ind.  | -      |   | -      |   | -      |   | -       |   | -          |   | -     | -     |
| Cath. | 84     |   | 48     |   | -      |   | -       |   | 32         |   | 164   |       |
|       |        |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |            |   |       | 2,847 |
| 1990  |        |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |            |   |       |       |
| Govt  | 1,224  |   | 626    |   | 227    |   | 170     |   | 516        |   | 2,763 |       |
| Ind.  | -      |   | -      |   | -      |   | -       |   | -          |   | -     | -     |
| Cath. | 135    |   | 90     |   | 58     |   | 10      |   | 14         |   | 307   | 3,070 |
| 1991  |        |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |            |   |       |       |
| Govt  | 1247   |   | 968    |   | 217    |   | 156     |   | 521        |   | 3,109 |       |
| Ind.  | -      |   | -      |   | -      |   | -       |   | -          |   | -     | -     |
| Cath. | 244    |   | 171    |   | 97     |   | 65      |   | 26         |   | 603   | 3,712 |

Table 7  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in Tasmania

| 1991  | Year 7 |    | Year 8 |    | Year 9 |    | Year 10 |    | Year 11 |    | Year 12 |   | All | Total |
|-------|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|---------|----|---------|----|---------|---|-----|-------|
|       | M      | F  | M      | F  | M      | F  | M       | F  | M       | F  | M       | F |     |       |
| Govt  | 24     | 27 | 62     | 71 | 55     | 43 | 26      | 42 | 8       | 16 | 2       | 1 | 377 | 377   |
| Ind.  | -      |    | -      |    | -      |    | -       |    | -       |    | -       |   | -   | -     |
| Cath. | -      |    | -      |    | -      |    | -       |    | -       |    | -       |   | -   | -     |

Table 8  
Number of students studying Japanese at the secondary level in the Northern Territory

## APPENDIX 3 HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TEACHING JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIA IN 1992

- \* Australian Catholic University
  - (Social Science, from later 1993 Humanities) Mercy campus, Vic
  - (Arts and Sciences) Mount St Mary campus, Strathfield, NSW
- \* Australian National University (Japan Centre), ACT
- \* Ballarat University College, Vic (commenced 1993)
- \* Bond University, Qld
- \* Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, NSW
- \* Curtin University of Technology (School of Social Sciences), WA
- \* Deakin University, Toorak, Vic
- \* Edith Cowan University (Department of Language Studies), Mt. Lawley, WA
- \* Flinders University, SA
- \* Griffith University, Qld
  - (Faculty of Asian and International studies) Nathan campus
  - (Faculty of Education and the Arts) Gold Coast campus
- \* James Cook University of North Queensland (Faculty of Arts), Qld
- \* La Trobe University (Division of Asian Languages), Vic
- \* Macquarie University (School of Modern Languages), NSW
- \* Monash University (Department of Japanese Studies), Clayton, Caulfield and Frankston campuses, Vic
- \* Murdoch University (Japanese Studies Section, Asian Studies Programme, School of Humanities), WA
- \* Queensland University of Technology (School of Humanities, Faculty of Arts), Qld
- \* Royal Melbourne University of Technology, Vic
- \* Swinburne University of Technology (Discipline of Asian Languages and Cultures), Vic
- \* University of Adelaide (Centre for Asian Studies), SA
- \* University of Canberra (Division of Information, Language and Culture), ACT
- \* University of Central Queensland (School of Humanities and Social Sciences), Qld
- \* University of Melbourne (Department of Asian Languages), Vic
- \* University of Newcastle (Faculty of Arts), NSW
- \* University of New England, NSW
  - (Centre for Media-Communications and Asian Studies), Northern Rivers campus
  - Armidale campus
- \* University of New South Wales (Economics and Commerce), NSW
- \* University of Queensland (Japanese and Chinese Studies), Qld
- \* University of Sydney (Faculty of Arts, School of Asian Studies), NSW
- \* University of Tasmania (Department of Modern Languages), Tas
- \* University of Western Australia (Faculty of Economics and Commerce), WA
- \* University of Western Sydney (Department of Language and Interaction Studies) Nepean Campus, NSW
- \* University of Wollongong (Department of Modern languages), NSW
- \* Victoria University of Technology, Vic

---

\* Universities which responded to the questionnaire for this project.

## APPENDIX 4 EFTSU ENROLMENT FIGURES FOR JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN 1992

| Name of Institution                                                                      | Total Jap.<br>(unit) EFTSU | Undergrad.<br>EFTSU for<br>Japanese<br>language only | Postgrad. Jap<br>(unit) EFTSU |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Australian Catholic University<br>(Mercy campus, Melb.)<br>(Strathfield campus, Syd.) | N/A <sup>7</sup><br>N/A    | N/A<br>N/A                                           | 0                             |
| 2. Australian National University                                                        | 73                         | N/A                                                  | 3                             |
| 3. Bond University                                                                       |                            |                                                      |                               |
| 4. Charles Sturt University                                                              |                            |                                                      |                               |
| 5. Curtin University of Technology                                                       | 77                         | 65                                                   | 0                             |
| 6. Deakin University<br>(Toorak campus)                                                  | 5                          |                                                      | 5                             |
| 7. Edith Cowan University                                                                | 70                         | 70                                                   | 0                             |
| 8. Flinders University                                                                   |                            |                                                      |                               |
| 9. Griffith University<br>(Nathan campus)<br>(Gold Coast campus)                         | 99<br>N/A                  | 77<br>N/A                                            | N/A                           |
| 10. James Cook University                                                                | 92                         | 92                                                   | 0                             |
| 11. La Trobe University                                                                  | 75                         | 75                                                   | 0                             |
| 12. Macquarie University                                                                 | 105                        | 105                                                  | 0                             |
| 13. Monash University                                                                    | 325                        | 218                                                  | 25                            |
| 14. Murdoch University                                                                   | 105                        | 64                                                   | 0.5                           |
| 15. Queensland University of Technology                                                  | 22                         | 22                                                   | 0                             |
| 16. Royal Melbourne Institute<br>of Technology                                           |                            |                                                      |                               |
| 17. Swinburne University of Technology                                                   | 52                         | 48                                                   | 13                            |
| 18. University of Adelaide                                                               | 156                        | 126                                                  | 1                             |
| 19. University of Canberra                                                               | 31                         | 31                                                   | 0                             |
| 20. University of Central Queensland                                                     | N/A                        | N/A                                                  | 0                             |
| 21. University of Melbourne                                                              | 144                        | N/A                                                  | 9                             |
| 22. University of Newcastle                                                              | 97 (1991)                  | 97                                                   | 2                             |
| 23. University of New England<br>(Northern Rivers campus)<br>(Armidale campus)           | N/A                        | N/A                                                  |                               |
| 24. University of New South Wales                                                        | 81                         | 81                                                   | 4                             |
| 25. University of Queensland                                                             | N/A                        | 208                                                  | 23                            |
| 26. University of Sydney                                                                 | N/A                        | N/A                                                  | N/A                           |
| 27. University of Tasmania                                                               | 75                         | 75                                                   | 1.5                           |
| 28. University of Western Australia                                                      | 96                         | 76                                                   | 1                             |
| 29. University of Western Sydney                                                         | N/A                        | N/A                                                  |                               |
| 30. University of Wollongong                                                             | N/A                        | N/A                                                  |                               |
| 31. Victoria University of Technology                                                    |                            |                                                      |                               |
| Total                                                                                    | 1,780+ <sup>8</sup>        | 1,530+                                               | 88+                           |

<sup>7</sup> N/A is used here where questionnaire respondents could not supply the figure or where they obviously gave an incorrect figure (indicating their own lack of familiarity with the EFTSU). Blanks are left for those universities which did not respond to the survey.

<sup>8</sup> Pluses are given to indicate that the actual number is higher, because of missing statistics for some universities.

## APPENDIX 5 STUDENT ENROLMENT FIGURES FOR JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN 1992

| Name of Institution                                                        | 1st Year           | 2nd Year                      | 3rd Year               | 4th Year (Hon.) | Grad. Dip | MA  | PhD |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----|-----|
| 1. Australian Catholic University (Mercy, Melbourne) (Strathfield, Sydney) | 22<br>23           | 5<br>11                       | 11                     |                 |           |     |     |
| 2. Australian National University                                          | 142                | 85                            | 54                     | 14              |           | 1   | 3   |
| 3. Bond University                                                         |                    |                               |                        |                 |           |     |     |
| 4. Charles Sturt University                                                |                    |                               |                        |                 |           |     |     |
| 5. Curtin University of Technology                                         | 166                | 59                            | 51                     | 1               |           |     |     |
| 6. Deakin University (Toorak campus)                                       |                    |                               |                        |                 | 5         |     |     |
| 7. Edith Cowan University                                                  | 55                 | 33                            | 10                     | -               |           |     |     |
| 8. Flinders University                                                     |                    |                               |                        |                 |           |     |     |
| 9. Griffith University (Nathan campus) (Gold Coast campus)                 | 189<br>78          | 91<br>72                      | N/A <sup>9</sup><br>35 | N/A             | N/A       | N/A | N/A |
| 10. James Cook University                                                  | 187                | 82                            | 27                     |                 |           |     |     |
| 11. La Trobe University                                                    | 108                | 77                            | 73                     |                 |           |     |     |
| 12. Macquarie University                                                   | 132<br>(core unit) | 74                            | 45                     | N/A             |           |     |     |
| 13. Monash University                                                      | 233                | 166                           | 132                    | 6               | 59        | 17  | 8   |
| 14. Murdoch University                                                     | 155                | 50                            | 28                     | -               | 1         | 1   | -   |
| 15. Queensland University of Technology                                    | 120                | 58                            |                        |                 |           |     |     |
| 16. Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology                                |                    |                               |                        |                 |           |     |     |
| 17. Swinburne University of Technology                                     | 116                | 78                            | 46                     | 1               | 37        |     |     |
| 18. University of Adelaide                                                 | 214                | 106                           | 67                     | 3               | -         | -   | 1   |
| 19. University of Canberra                                                 | 111                | sp.44 <sup>10</sup><br>wr. 22 | sp.22<br>wr.11         |                 |           |     |     |
| 20. University of Central Queensland                                       | 92                 | 30                            | 22                     | 2               |           |     |     |
| 21. University of Melbourne                                                | 275                | 135                           | 50                     | 4               | 26        |     |     |
| 22. University of Newcastle                                                | 180                | 160                           | 60                     | 3               | -         | 4   | 1   |
| 23. University of New England (Northern Rivers campus) (Armidale campus)   | 75                 | 59                            |                        |                 |           |     |     |
| 24. University of New South Wales                                          | 330                | 154                           | 43                     | 1               | 5         | 24? |     |
| 25. University of Queensland                                               | sp.344<br>wr.283   | sp. 267<br>wr.276             | sp. 88<br>wr.128       | 10              |           | 14  | 7   |
| 26. University of Sydney                                                   | 215                | 118                           | 88                     | 1               | 10        | 30  | 9   |
| 27. University of Tasmania                                                 | 100                | 85                            | 50                     |                 | 3         | 0   | 0   |

<sup>9</sup> N/A is used here where questionnaire respondents could not supply the figure or when they obviously gave an incorrect figure (indicating their own lack of familiarity with the EFTSL). Blanks are left for those universities which did not respond to the survey.

<sup>10</sup> Where separate enrolments are given for spoken and written languages courses, the highest figure only has been counted in the total.

|       |                                   |                      |        |        |     |      |     |     |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| 28.   | University of Western Australia   | 112                  | 140    | 46     | 2   | -    | 0   | 1   |
| 29.   | University of Western Sydney      | 45                   | 15     |        |     |      |     |     |
| 30.   | University of Wollongong          | N/A                  | N/A    |        |     |      |     |     |
| 31.   | Victoria University of Technology |                      |        |        |     |      |     |     |
| Total |                                   | 3,819+ <sup>11</sup> | 2,245+ | 1,088+ | 48+ | 146+ | 91+ | 30+ |

---

<sup>11</sup> Pluses are given to indicate that the actual number is higher, because of missing statistics for some universities.

## APPENDIX 6      ADDITIONAL DATA ON HIGHER EDUCATION STAFF TEACHING JAPANESE

| Staff      | Qld        | NSW        | Vic        | WA         | SA         | ACT       | Total        |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Native     | 18 (62.07) | 21 (75.00) | 28 (71.79) | 10 (66.67) | 7 (100.00) | 3 (42.86) | 88 (69.84)   |
| Non-Native | 11 (37.93) | 7 (25.00)  | 11 (28.21) | 5 (33.33)  | 0 (-)      | 4 (-)     | 38 (30.16)   |
| Total      | 29 (23.02) | 28 (22.22) | 39 (30.95) | 15 (11.90) | 7 (5.56)   | 7 (5.56)  | 126 (100.00) |

Table 1  
*State distribution of Japanese language staff in our survey*

| Age of staff | No. of staff | %      |
|--------------|--------------|--------|
| 20-24        | 3            | 2.5    |
| 25-29        | 18           | 14.5   |
| 30-39        | 50           | 40     |
| 40-49        | 40           | 32     |
| 50-          | 14           | 11     |
| Total        | 125          | 100.00 |

Table 2  
*Age of Japanese language staff*

| Subjects     | No. of staff |
|--------------|--------------|
| Literature   | 17           |
| History      | 15           |
| Linguistics  | 11           |
| Language     | 6            |
| Economics    | 5            |
| Anthropology | 4            |

Table 3  
*Study of Japan-related subjects by non-native staff*

| Study in Japan                        | No. of staff |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Study language at Japanese university | 17           |
| Study language at other institution   | 13           |
| Study non-language course             | 9            |
| Participation in student exchange     | 8            |

Table 4  
*Study in Japan by non-native staff*

| Visits to Japan  | No. of staff |
|------------------|--------------|
| Holiday          | 20           |
| Research         | 12           |
| Working holiday  | 7            |
| Teaching English | 6            |
| Other work       | 6            |
| Sabbatical       | 6            |
| Jet Program      | 7            |
| Teacher exchange | 2            |

Table 5  
*Reasons for non-native staff to visit Japan*



| Years in Japan | No. of staff | %  |
|----------------|--------------|----|
| 0              | 2            | 5  |
| 1              | 6            | 16 |
| 2              | 11           | 29 |
| 3              | 6            | 16 |
| 4              | 5            | 13 |
| 5              | 3            | 8  |
| 6              | 3            | 8  |
| 7              | 1            | 3  |
| 17             | 1            | 3  |
| Total          | 38           |    |

Table 6  
Total time spent in Japan by non-native staff

| Qualifications | No. of staff | %  |
|----------------|--------------|----|
| BA             | 81           | 64 |
| BA Hons        | 38           | 30 |
| Diploma        | 39           | 31 |
| MA             | 48           | 38 |
| PhD            | 12           | 10 |
| Other          | 2            | 2  |

Table 7  
Academic qualifications\* of all Japanese language staff (N=126)  
\*Multiple answers possible

| Undergraduate majors | No. of staff | %  |
|----------------------|--------------|----|
| Japanese language    | 34           | 27 |
| English              | 28           | 22 |
| Literature           | 27           | 21 |
| Education            | 21           | 17 |
| Japanese studies     | 17           | 13 |
| Linguistics          | 17           | 13 |
| Language teaching    | 15           | 12 |
| History              | 12           | 10 |
| Anthropology         | 10           | 8  |

Table 8  
Undergraduate majors\* of all Japanese language staff  
\*Multiple answers possible

| Postgraduate study | No. of staff | %  |
|--------------------|--------------|----|
| Linguistics        | 38           | 66 |
| Japanese language  | 15           | 26 |
| Literature         | 10           | 17 |
| Other              | 5            | 9  |

Table 9  
Japan-related postgraduate studies completed by Japanese language staff

| Teacher-training course            | No. of staff | %  |
|------------------------------------|--------------|----|
| Short-term course                  | 25           | 32 |
| Specialised postgraduate program   | 19           | 25 |
| Subject in teacher training course | 18           | 23 |
| Subject in postgraduate program    | 16           | 21 |
| Subject in undergraduate degree    | 9            | 12 |
| Correspondence course              | 5            | 6  |
| Other                              | 10           | 13 |

Table 10  
Completion of course\* on teaching Japanese by Japanese language staff  
\* Multiple answers possible

| Status    | No. of staff | %     |
|-----------|--------------|-------|
| Full-time | 86           | 68.25 |
| Part-time | 8            | 6.35  |
| Sessional | 31           | 24.31 |

Table 11  
Employment status of Japanese language staff

| Appointment         | No. of staff | %  |
|---------------------|--------------|----|
| Permanent           | 35           | 28 |
| Contract/fixed term | 59           | 47 |
| Yearly/half yearly  | 23           | 18 |
| Other               | 6            | 5  |
| Total               | 123          |    |

Table 12  
Terms of appointment of Japanese language staff

| Level                | No. of staff | %   |
|----------------------|--------------|-----|
| Level A (ass.lect.)  | 43           | 34  |
| Level B (lec.)       | 45           | 36  |
| Level C (sen.lect.)  | 9            | 7   |
| Level D (assoc.prof) | 1            | 0.8 |
| Level E (prof)       | 1            | 0.8 |
| Sessional            | 25           | 20  |
| Total                | 124          |     |

Table 13  
Levels of position of Japanese language staff

| Hours | No. of staff |
|-------|--------------|
| 1     | 1            |
| 2     | 4            |
| 3     | 2            |
| 4     | 6            |
| 5     | 2            |
| 6     | 3            |
| 7     | 1            |
| 8     | 2            |
| 9     | 3            |
| 13    | 1            |
| 14    | 2            |
| 15    | 1            |
| 16    | 2            |
| 20    | 1            |

Table 14  
Hours taught by sessional staff

| Hours | No. of staff |
|-------|--------------|
| 2     | 4            |
| 3     | 3            |
| 4     | 4            |
| 5     | 4            |
| 6     | 9            |
| 7     | 2            |
| 8     | 8            |
| 9     | 15           |
| 10    | 23           |
| 11    | 5            |

|    |    |
|----|----|
| 12 | 18 |
| 13 | 10 |
| 14 | 6  |
| 15 | 1  |
| 16 | 3  |
| 18 | 1  |
| 19 | 1  |
| 20 | 1  |
| 24 | 2  |

Table 15  
Hours taught by non-sessional Japanese language staff

| Level     | No MA or PhD | MA       | PhD      | MA and PhD | Either MA or PhD | Total      |
|-----------|--------------|----------|----------|------------|------------------|------------|
| Level A   | 31 (72%)     | 11 (26%) | 1 (2%)   | 0          | 13 (28%)         | 43         |
| Level B   | 18 (40%)     | 21 (47%) | 3 (7%)   | 3 (7%)     | 27 (61%)         | 45         |
| Level C   | 0            | 6 (67%)  | 2 (22%)  | 1 (22%)    | 9 (100%)         | 9          |
| Level D   | 0            | 0        | 0        | 1 (100%)   | 1 (100%)         | 1          |
| Level E   | 0            | 0        | 1 (100%) | 0          | 1 (100%)         | 1          |
| Sessional | 21 (84%)     | 4 (16%)  | 0        | 0          | 4 (100%)         | 25         |
| Total     | 70 (56%)     | 42 (34%) | 7 (5%)   | 5 (4%)     | 55 (43%)         | 126 (100%) |

Table 16  
Level of position of Japanese language staff cross-tabulated with postgraduate qualifications

| No. of students | No. of staff |
|-----------------|--------------|
| None            | 105          |
| 1 student       | 10           |
| 2               | 3            |
| 3               | 5            |
| 5               | 1            |
| 8               | 1            |
| 11              | 1            |

Table 17  
Supervision of Honours and postgraduate students

| Research                                 | No. of staff |
|------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Publications in last 3 years             | 41           |
| Engagement in research project           | 29           |
| Attendance at conference in past 2 years | 76           |
| Conference papers written                | 30           |

Table 18  
Research activities of Japanese language staff

| Types of in-service             | No. of staff | %  |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----|
| Materials development           | 65           | 52 |
| Teaching techniques/methodology | 61           | 48 |
| Language proficiency up-grading | 39           | 24 |
| Teaching new syllabuses         | 29           | 23 |
| Language maintenance            | 26           | 21 |
| No interest                     | 18           | 14 |

Table 19  
Interest in in-service training

## APPENDIX 7 ATTITUDINAL SURVEY FORM



### KEY LANGUAGES PROJECT

### LANGUAGE STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

For information contact Athol Yates, National Language and Literacy  
Institute of Australia, 112 Wellington Parade, East Melbourne Vic 3002  
Tel: (03) 416 2422 Fax (03) 416 0231

Name of School \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of school: ☐ State  
☐ Catholic  
☐ Independent

#### Part A: Student Profile

1. Sex ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. If you were not born in Australia, at what age did you come to Australia? \_\_\_\_\_  
From which country did you come? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What level of education did your parents reach? *(Tick only one box for each parent)*

|                      | Father                   | Mother                   |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Primary              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Post primary         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Year 12              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Undergraduate degree | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Post graduate degree | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please specify  
Mother: \_\_\_\_\_  
Father: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Part B: Language background

4. Which language other than English is used at home? *(Tick only one box)*

|                                                |                                             |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> French                | <input type="checkbox"/> Spanish            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> German                | <input type="checkbox"/> Italian            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Indonesian            | <input type="checkbox"/> An Italian dialect |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Malay                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Arabic             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandarin Chinese      | <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cantonese             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other language     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Chinese dialect | Please specify _____                        |
| Please specify _____                           | <input type="checkbox"/> English only       |
5. Do you speak this language with: *(You can tick more than one box)*

|                                                     |                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mother                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Grandparents                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Father                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Other relatives                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Brothers and sisters       | <input type="checkbox"/> People from your parents' country |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Please specify _____ |                                                            |

6. What subjects are you studying at school this year?

---



---



---

7. To which level do you intend to study? (Tick only one box)

- ☐ Year 11  
☐ Year 12  
☐ TAFE  
☐ Tertiary institution

### Part C: Language study at school

*All of the following questions are about languages other than English, but do not refer to Latin.*

8. Did you study a language at school (including Saturday School or Ethnic School) when you were in Year 10?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

*(If you answered "No", this is the last question for you.)*

9. Which language or languages did you study at Year 10?

Language 1: (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Language 2: (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

*(Questions 10 to 13 will be about the language you named as Language 1, questions 14 to 17 will be about the language you named as Language 2.)*

10. If you discontinued Language 1 after Year 10, which of the following factors contributed to your decision?

- ☐ I did not wish to continue. (You can tick more than one box)

This was because

- ☐ I do not like languages  
☐ There were too many native speakers in the class  
☐ The subject was too difficult  
☐ My friends did not take this language  
☐ I did not like the teacher  
☐ Other reasons  
 Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ I would have liked to continue, however ... (You can tick more than one box)

- ☐ The language was not available  
☐ I considered other subjects more important for my overall study plan.  
☐ There were time table clashes with other subjects  
☐ Other reasons  
 Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

11. If you are studying Language 1 this year, how important were the following factors for your decision to continue? Rate your answers on a scale from 1 = "not important" to 5 = "very important".

|                                                                                                               |                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ethnic origin and /or religion                                                                                | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| Contact with the ethnic community in Australia which speaks Language 1                                        | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| Other contact with the country where the language is spoken (past travel, friends, parents' work, etc.)       | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I thought this would be an easy subject for me.                                                               | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I had good marks in the past.                                                                                 | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I like studying languages.                                                                                    | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I like studying about the culture and society of the country where the language is spoken.                    | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I particularly like the teacher.                                                                              | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I do not have definite plans for the future but I feel the language would enhance my future career prospects. | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I have definite plans to work in an area of employment where the language is used.                            | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I want to travel or live in the country.                                                                      | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I have been advised to continue by my family.                                                                 | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| I have been advised to continue by my teachers.                                                               | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| One or more of my friends was taking the subject.                                                             | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |
| Although I had no strong desire to continue, other subjects were even less attractive.                        | 1__2__3__4__5                     |
|                                                                                                               | not important      very important |

Other factors

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

12. To which level do you intend to study Language 1? (Tick only one box)

[ ] Year 11  
 [ ] Year 12  
 [ ] TAFE  
 [ ] Tertiary institution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13. How do you rate your ability to use Language 1?

|                         | Poor | Good | Very Good | Fluent |
|-------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------|
| Speaking                | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]       | [ ]    |
| Listening comprehension | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]       | [ ]    |
| Writing                 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]       | [ ]    |
| Reading                 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]       | [ ]    |

If the language has a different script from English, how do you find using the writing system.

1\_\_2\_\_3\_\_4\_\_5  
very easy

very difficult

**The following questions will be answered by students who studied two languages (not including Latin) in Year 10.**

14. If you discontinued Language 2 after Year 10, which of the following factors contributed to your decision?

[ ] I did not wish to continue. *(You can tick more than one box)*

This was because

- ☐ I do not like languages
- ☐ There were too many native speakers in the class
- ☐ The subject was too difficult
- ☐ My friends did not take this language
- ☐ I did not like the teacher
- ☐ Other reasons

Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] I would have liked to continue, however ... *(You can tick more than one box)*

- ☐ The language was not available
- ☐ I considered other subjects more important for my overall study plan.
- ☐ There were time table clashes with other subjects
- ☐ Other reasons

Please specify \_\_\_\_\_



15. If you are studying Language 2 this year, how important were the following factors for your decision to continue? Rate your answers on a scale from 1 = "not important" to 5 = "very important".

|                                                            |                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Ethnic origin and /or religion                             | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| Contact with the ethnic community in Australia             | not important                      very important |
| which speaks Language 2                                    | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| Other contact with the country where the language          | not important                      very important |
| is spoken (past travel, friends, parents' work, etc.)      | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| I thought this would be an easy subject for me.            | not important                      very important |
| I had good marks in the past.                              | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| I like studying languages.                                 | not important                      very important |
| I like studying about the culture and society of the       | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| country where the language is spoken.                      | not important                      very important |
| I particularly like the teacher.                           | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| I do not have definite plans for the future but I feel the | not important                      very important |
| language would enhance my future career prospects.         | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| I have definite plans to work in an area of employment     | not important                      very important |
| where the language is used.                                | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| I want to travel or live in the country.                   | not important                      very important |
| I have been advised to continue by my family.              | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| I have been advised to continue by my teachers.            | not important                      very important |
| One or more of my friends was taking the subject.          | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| Although I had no strong desire to continue,               | not important                      very important |
| other subjects were even less attractive.                  | 1__2__3__4__5                                     |
| Other factors                                              | not important                      very important |
| Please specify: _____                                      |                                                   |

16. To which level do you intend to study Language 2? (Tick only one box)

- ☐ Year 11  
☐ Year 12  
☐ TAFE  
☐ Tertiary institution

17. How do you rate your ability to use Language 2?

|                         |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Poor                    |                          |                          | Very<br>Fluent           |                          |
| Speaking                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Listening comprehension | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Writing                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reading                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If the language has a different script from English, how do you find using the writing system.

very easy      1\_\_2\_\_3\_\_4\_\_5      very difficult

End of questionnaire

Thank you for your cooperation.

# ***Language & Literacy Publications***

## **Unlocking Australia's Language Potential: Profiles of 9 Key Languages in Australia**

**Volume 1: Arabic**

**Volume 2: Chinese**

**Volume 3: French**

**Volume 4: German**

**Volume 5: Indonesian/Malay**

**Volume 6: Italian**

**Volume 7: Japanese**

**Volume 8: Modern Greek**

**Volume 9: Spanish**

**Summary Volume**

The 9 Language Profiles and Summary Volume examine the Australian situation of the 9 languages of Wider Teaching (as identified by the National Policy on Languages) and make recommendations to enhance the learning of these languages in Australia. The reports will be particularly useful for applied linguists, curriculum developers and language policy makers.

## **ESL Development: Languages and Literacy in Schools**

A practical resource for Australian teachers for assessing and reporting the progress of non-English speaking background students. It also provides information on the characteristics of second language learning in schools and some ideas on how to meet students' ESL needs.

## **The Australian Second Language Learning Program**

A detailed description of projects and materials produced by projects funded under the Australian Second Language Learning Program between 1988 and 1992. ASLLP is a Commonwealth initiative designed to stimulate language studies in Australian schools.

## **Directory of Scholarships For Language Students and Professionals 1993**

Contains over 250 different entries on scholarships, exchange schemes, fellowships and other awards for people who are studying, researching or teaching languages, linguistics, applied linguistics, language pedagogy and related disciplines.

## **ABC For Exporters: A Beginner's Cultural Checklist**

Provides a comprehensive list of language and cultural issues which organisations with no experience in exporting need to consider before developing an export plan.

## **Languages at the Crossroads**

Consists of two volumes; the Report and Guide to the Report. The Report provides a detailed examination of policy and practical situation of language teaching in Australia. It also explores demand, supply, recruitment, deployment, professional development and job satisfaction of teachers. The Guide provides selected elements and highlights of the Report.

## **Language and Language Education Vol 1, No 1. & Vol 2, No 1.**

Working papers of the NLLIA. Vol 1, No 1 includes articles on inter-cultural communication and rapid profiling. Vol 2, No 1 will be of particular interest to those involved with language policy and practice in schools.

## **The Relationship Between International Trade and Linguistic Competence**

Department of Employment, Education and Training.

## **Room For Two: A Study of Bilingual Education at Bayswater South Primary School**

By Sue Fernandez. The extensive experience gained from managing the German bilingual program at Bayswater South Primary School is of relevance to all schools that have or are considering a language program.

Publications can be ordered from:

NLLIA, 9th Level, 300 Flinders St, Melbourne Vic 3000  
Tel: 03 614 0255 Fax: 03 629 4708

## Volume 7: Japanese

The inventiveness, originality and vigour of Japanese civilisation has long been covered under the Euro-centric world view of the West and the unfortunate attempt of Japan to join the Western nations in colonial expansion. Japan is the first non-European nation which has fully developed a truly modern culture, while retaining the wisdom and beauty of its traditions. Japan today also has a powerful economy, with the second highest GNP in the world. Many nations look to Japan as a model for restructuring and further development.

The build-up of Australian-Japanese relations after WWII and changes in Australian perceptions of the world have led to a sudden increase in interest by the Australian community in the study of the Japanese language.

This Profile surveys all levels of Japanese learning in Australia and presents a number of recommendations for improving it. Building on the conviction that it is very important to promote the study of the Japanese language, the Profile recommends the development of cultural/language studies rather than narrow language teaching. The Profile also recommends the freeing of the teaching process from the traditional classroom and emphasizes the benefit for Australia of further contacts with Japan.

## Profiles of 9 Languages of Wider Teaching

### The Nine Languages

The nine languages featured in these profile studies were categorised as Languages of Wider Teaching. The nine languages are: Arabic, Modern Standard Chinese, French, German, Modern Greek, Indonesian/Malay, Italian, Japanese and Spanish.

These languages represent the vast bulk of the second language learning effort in Australian education. As such, these languages consume the greatest proportion of the resources devoted to the teaching of second languages in this country and will do so for several years to come. These nine were selected for reasons of domestic importance, such as community bilingualism and equal educational opportunities for minority language speakers, and international importance, such as economic and political significance.

### Background

The nine languages were designated Languages of Wider Teaching by the 1987 National Policy on Languages. Resources were provided to promote the teaching of these languages and in early 1990, the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education, which was charged with the responsibility for the implementation of the National Policy on Languages, decided to review their progress since 1987. These 9 languages have now been incorporated into the 14 Priority Languages of the Australian Language and Literacy Policy expanding the priority list to include Aboriginal languages, Korean, Russian, Thai and Vietnamese.

### The Profiles

The 9 Profiles represent more than a review of the state of play of these languages. The studies promise to bring about a more precise and language-specific form of planning for the teaching and learning of languages in Australia and therefore could well represent a more mature phase in policy making itself. In recent years, language policies have made only generic statements about individual languages or groups of languages. Since there is now a high level of consensus across Australia about the importance of language study, these Profiles will shift the focus to particular issues that affect individual languages.

### Who Will Use These Profiles?

These Profiles will be invaluable to all people involved in language and business. Specifically, users will include language policy makers and planners, teachers, lecturers, the media, business associations and researchers.

### Uses

The Profiles will be used for planning school and higher education programs, curriculum writing, research, estimating needs in interpreting and translating, and estimating the needs of business to target overseas markets. They will be of continuing value as a stocktake of the 9 studied languages but also of value to the methodology of profiling. The NLLIA intends to study other languages in this same way.